

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1880.

## The Week.

THE Whittaker case has reached what is doubtless its final stage, through the report of the experts employed to examine the handwriting. They were furnished with the note of warning which Whittaker said he had received and miscellaneous specimens of the writing of all the cadets, in numbered lots; but these lots were, as we understand it, differently numbered when furnished to each expert. The five experts have now reported, agreeing that the writer of the note of warning was also the writer of Whittaker's papers. A still more startling report was made by one of them, Mr. Southworth. He found that the paper on which the note of warning was written was torn off from a sheet on which Whittaker had begun a letter to his mother, and this from another on which there was in continuation some other writing of Whittaker's. In fact the note of warning was in one or other of two ways connected with three pieces of Whittaker's acknowledged handwriting. The announcement of this discovery produced a great sensation in court. Mr. Southworth, the expert, who is an elderly man, and, by the way, an old abolitionist, was so affected by it, after making it, that he took to his bed. Whittaker seems to have borne it coolly, and is evidently a young man of great nerve and aplomb. The case against him now consists of this unanimous report of the experts; of Mr. Southworth's additional discovery; of the fact that though, according to his own story, hit on the head by an Indian club, his head bore no mark, though the club had blood on it; that though hit on the nose with a looking-glass, the glass was not broken or the skin of his nose abraded; that though choked into unconsciousness by pressure on his throat, his throat bore no signs of such pressure; that though cadets were sleeping in the rooms all about him, he made no outcry or other noise.

His own case is, that he cannot account for the failure of his head, throat, and nose to show marks of violence; that he made no outcry because his assailants had led him to fear that they would kill him if he did so; that the resemblance of the note of warning to his handwriting is the result of forgery; and that the paper on which the note was written must have been torn off from the sheet containing his letter to his mother by one of the conspirators, who stealthily obtained access to his drawer in his room. We must note here, however, that if the identity of the paper had been part of the conspiracy, the tearing would not have been made so smooth and true as to require close fitting to recognize it. In fact, the conspirators seem to have, according to him, made every provision for his ruin that human foresight could suggest. The effect of all this on public opinion at this writing is hardly ascertainable. That it was coming seems to have been perceived some days ago by that Son of Thunder, Mr. Martin I. Townsend, for he deserted the case.

As far as the reputation of the School and of its officers is concerned it is most fortunate that the experts have been unanimous about the handwriting, and that their report should have been confirmed by the discovery about the paper, as the judgment of the court, unfortified by these things, would hardly have disarmed Republican prejudice. We say Republican prejudice, because the believers in Whittaker's guilt are divided from the believers in his innocence largely by party lines, and the state of mind of both throws some light on the great mystery of Congressional committee reports, in which the majority and minority always draw diametrically opposite conclusions from the same facts, under a law of the human mind which is not much known to the philosophers. We must say of the officers of the School that they

have borne themselves through this perplexing business, under a torrent of insult and abuse, with a dignity and patience which do great honor not only to them but to their profession and to the country. It now appears quite clear that they have from the beginning taken the utmost pains to get at the truth without fear or favor. The lawyers, on the other hand, have cut a somewhat ludicrous figure in the case. The two who appeared on the scene in order to show the soldiers how to detect crime appear to have united the heat and violence of a politician running for office with the perspicacious distrustfulness of a barracks washerwoman.

Whittaker's complexion and ability tend to confirm certain investigations of a *Times* correspondent who has had several years' experience in the South, from which it appears that there is something ethnological in the opposition to Grant which has unexpectedly manifested itself in various Southern Republican Conventions recently. Originally the "boom" placed large reliance upon Southern Republicans on account of the large proportion of negroes in that section of the party, the negroes being set down as solid for Grant. The discord manifested at the South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi conventions, and already visible on the Louisiana horizon, compels us to recognize the fact that, politically as well as ethnically, there are negroes and negroes. The *Times* reporter has discovered that the simple and honest and "full-blooded" are earnest advocates of a third term, and that the treacherous and cunning mulattoes are as unanimously opposed to it. Naturally, too, the "yellow men" are almost invariably to be found exercising their arts in favor of Secretary Sherman, who doubtless knows as well as the *Times* man that "the addition of white blood gives to the negro race more low cunning and what may be called 'smartness' than it does wisdom or any sense of honor," and unquestionably bears this in mind when he selects his "agents." In Mississippi these persons either acted "grossly and shamelessly," or displayed what is termed "double-faced neutrality," which is probably infinitely worse. In Louisiana, the yellow Chairman of the State Committee is also engaged in pulling wires for Sherman, but as he is being sharply watched by Pinchback—unaccountably a Grant mulatto—and others, he may come to grief.

The third-term movement received no greater impetus last week than the week before. Of four Republican State conventions, but one, Florida, instructed its delegates to vote for Grant at Chicago; Michigan, West Virginia, and Nevada being substantially solid for Blaine. In the Michigan Convention Professor Moses Coit Tyler presented the resolutions, which paid a tribute to the late Zachariah Chandler and requested the delegates to support Blaine as long as he should be in the field, which will be done by all except two or three district delegates; Senator Ferry's name was suggested for Vice-President, as was Thomas Settle's in Florida. The Wisconsin Democrats held an excited convention, and selected a delegation to Cincinnati which is supposed to be anti-Tilden if anything. In this State some of Blaine's supporters, who claim to be Independent Republicans, have publicly protested against the hostility to the "plumed knight" generally felt throughout the organization; a performance which suggests that the opportunity for capturing the Scratchers by the well known strategy of putting on their livery temporarily has been curiously neglected.

Six speeches have been made in the Senate on the Kellogg case, by Messrs. Hill, Hampton, Carpenter, Pendleton, Cameron of Wisconsin, and Saulsbury, and all but the first and last were adverse to Mr. Spofford's claims. It is clear that whether or not the Senate can reopen its own *res adjudicate*, it will not do so in this instance. The opposition of Messrs. Hampton and Pendleton to a measure dictated by their own party as a means of keeping control of

the Senate, should at least be remembered to *their* credit if not to the party's. If it was only worldly wisdom, in which the Democracy has been so sadly deficient ever since it lost control of the Government, it would be a hopeful sign for both the party and the country. The Senate has passed the Post-Office Appropriation Bill, and the House the give-and-take River and Harbor Bill. The House has also voted in favor of adjournment on May 31; and since a test vote on Friday showed that there is no hope of tariff reform at this session, there is little doubt that the adjournment will take place at the date fixed, unless delay be caused by the bill to regulate the electoral count, which report says the President will make the excuse for calling an extra session if it be not disposed of now.

Postmaster James has justified our belief in his sagacity by notifying the President that he does not desire the office of Postmaster-General Key. President Hayes, on his part, has already reached a decision, contrary to the report that he intended to await the action of the Chicago Convention. His choice is Mr. Horace Maynard, American Minister to Turkey, who, being politically "from Tennessee," though a native of Massachusetts, would seem a very natural successor to Judge Key. He was, however, appointed to his present post by General Grant, and his selection now is (prophetically) not inconsistent with Mr. Hayes's alleged desire "to give the position to some one identified with the interests of the Republican nominee" at Chicago.

The correspondence between Secretary Evarts and Lord Salisbury about the incident known as the Fortune Bay outrage has been sent to Congress, but we have not at this writing seen anything more than the newspaper summaries of it. The controversy arises out of the fact that American fishermen attempting, in January, 1878, on the Newfoundland coast, to exercise the right of fishing conceded to them by the Treaty of Washington, and paid for with the \$5,000,000 awarded by the Halifax Commission, were driven off by a mob of the local fishermen. This Lord Salisbury defends, if not justifies, by the argument that the American fishermen were violating provincial legislation in force when the Treaty was made, which forbids fishing on Sunday and the use of seines to catch herring between October and April, and the use of them in a certain manner at any season. Mr. Evarts replies that the fishing rights were bought from Great Britain in their simplest form, and without reference to local legislation. Lord Salisbury rejoins that they were bought subject to existing, but free from any subsequent, local legislation. Mr. Evarts concludes that in this shape they were worth nothing, and shall not be paid for any longer; so he recommends Congress to repeal the act admitting provincial fish and fish-oil duty free, and to apply the duties, as far as may be necessary, to compensating the sufferers from the Fortune Bay outrage.

There is strong reason for believing that Lord Salisbury's position was in part due to the necessity which the Tories thought the unpopularity of the Washington Treaty imposed on them of taking firm ground against all American claims arising under it. The concessions made by Mr. Gladstone's Government as to the *Alabama* claims have figured for several years among the "unparalleled humiliations" brought on Great Britain by the Liberals, and which it has been part of the Tory mission to obliterate. A renewal of the negotiations with the Liberals will probably bring about some arrangement which will render the continued observance of the Treaty satisfactory to both sides. Even if Mr. Evarts's position that the fishery rights were conveyed in their natural state be sound—and it doubtless is—local regulations which have for their object the preservation of the fisheries for the benefit of all who use them, whether natives or foreigners, are things which a civilized people can hardly refuse to agree to, however much they may resent having them imposed upon them. No regulations, however, will stand which are enforced, as in the Fortune Bay case, by a mob.

The liquidation of the "bull speculation" in stocks continued

during the week in Wall Street, and there was a further heavy decline in prices. There are few leading stocks which are not 10 to 15 full points lower than early in March; many are 20 to 30 points lower, while some have fallen 40 to 50 points. The decline has been, as a rule, much larger reckoned by percentage than by "points." Naturally enough, this shrinkage in prices, which has been almost as great in the merchandise markets subject to speculation, has released a great deal of money that was used in speculation, and has diminished the amount needed to carry stocks and commodities. The result on rates is a decline for those on demand loans from 5 to 6 per cent. to 3 to 5 per cent. The New York banks, which were below the 25 per cent. reserve a few weeks ago, now have a surplus reserve of over \$10,000,000. As money is now about as cheap in New York as in London, and as the imports of foreign goods continue very large, and the time of year has arrived when the exports of domestic products are comparatively small, the foreign-exchange market here is firm, although yet below the gold-exporting point. The market for silver continues dull and steady, at about 52*d.* to 52½*d.* in London. Here the "buzzard dollar" has a bullion value of about 88½ cents.

Prince Bismarck has lately been having a good deal of vexatious experience. He had hardly got the better of the Federal Council in the matter of the stamp-duty on post-office receipts when he was defeated in the Lower House in his Samoan scheme, described elsewhere by our Berlin correspondent. Close on this defeat has come the election of a Socialist deputy at Hamburg, of all places, by 13,155 votes, the Progressist candidate getting less than half that number, and the National Liberal only one-fourth of it. Hartmann, the successful candidate, got only 12,000 votes in 1878, so that it is plain that he and his principles are growing in favor. His victory is ascribed in part to the dissatisfaction of Altona, a suburb of Hamburg which lies within his district, with the prospect of being brought within the Zollverein; but after making all allowance for this, it furnishes an alarming proof of the progress made by Socialist ideas. Hartmann, too, has triumphed in spite of the fact that his electoral committee was arrested some time ago by the police, and he has been unable to circulate his views either by speech or writing.

The Irish Home-Rulers have been in active deliberation ever since the election, with the view of finding a basis for concerted action in the new Parliament; but the attempt thus far has been unsuccessful. Mr. Parnell has between thirty and forty followers who stick to him; but this is only about half the force, and the others have not as yet been won over, in spite of much conference. The main difficulty, apart from Mr. Parnell's arbitrary temper, seems to be his scheme of land reform, which he insists on converting into a party platform. It consists, in the first instance, of a stay law suspending for two years the right of ejectment from any holding valued at £10 a year or under, and suspending for the same period the right of recovering, for any holding, a rent higher than the poor-law valuation. Having in this way tied up the landlords for two years, he would have Parliament establish a commission empowered to lend money to all tenants wishing to purchase their holdings, the price to be fixed in all cases at a sum equal to twenty years of the poor-law valuation—the landlords to be compelled to sell. But even where the tenant did not wish to purchase his holding, the commission would have the right to force the landlord to sell it to them at the same rate, and then to let it to the tenant at three and a half per cent. on the purchase money. With this scheme the other section of Home-Rulers, led by Mr. Shaw, thus far refuses to have anything to do.

There is an anonymous article in the last *Fortnightly* on the English elections, which is popularly attributed to Mr. Gladstone, and both the matter and the manner leave hardly any doubt about the authorship. He ascribes the defeat of the Tories in part to the fact that they did not, during the last six years, represent the



traditional principles of the Conservative party as practised and preached by Sir Robert Peel, the typical Conservative statesman since 1832. These principles and characteristics were extreme purity in patronage; vigorous legislative activity; a rigid economy in expenditure; a regular maintenance of the principle that each and every year should square its own account; avoidance of all cause of collision with Liberalism in an open field; tenacious adherence to the parliamentary form of measures after they had once been proposed. Every one of these characteristics has been wanting, the writer maintains, in the Beaconsfield Conservatism, and he intimates pretty clearly that this latter Conservatism consisted simply of Lord Beaconsfield himself, and that the recent extraordinary victory of the Liberals was "the victory of the nation over an extraordinary man," and not the defeat of historic Conservatism.

The Tory papers continue to wage savage warfare on Mr. Gladstone for his apology to Austria. His offence is having officially apologized to a foreign Power for language spoken on the hustings to English voters, which his critics paint as one of the blackest offences known in English history. He unfortunately allowed it to be published without being accompanied by the rest of the correspondence, which contains, it is said, a full disavowal on the part of Austria of the designs against the independence of the Balkan Slavs which Mr. Gladstone had imputed to her. If this be true, the diplomatic triumph will fully atone for the indiscretion. Of course this last has been aggravated by Mr. Fawcett's, in his charge that the Tories kept back the news of the Indian deficit, which seems to have been really indefensible in its haste and rashness. The bitterness of feeling in Conservative circles in London against Mr. Gladstone seems to be on the increase, and finds vent in every sort of scurrility. The chances are, however, that this sort of thing if persisted in may rouse a counter indignation in the provinces which might take in expression a very Radical form. Lord Hartington appears to be covering Mr. Fawcett's retreat very effectively by publishing exposures of the financial operations of the Indian Government under the late Ministry. The Indian press is united in pronouncing the explanations of the blunder about the deficit as worse than the blunder itself, and it now appears that there has been something very like gross jobbery in the various contracts for supplies. A thorough exposure of these things will soon give the Tory papers more serious subjects for discussion than Gladstone's "unheard-of blunder" in the Austrian matter, or Fawcett's recklessness in the deficit affair.

The announcement has been made that the new editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* will be Mr. John Morley, the well-known author and editor of the *Fortnightly Review*. Nothing could well be more satisfactory to the Liberal readers of that journal. Mr. Morley, who unsuccessfully contested Westminster at the late election, is not so famous in politics as in other fields, but there is no abler political writing in the English periodical press than his comments on the home and foreign politics of the month in the *Fortnightly*.

The Italian elections have thus far resulted in the return of 156 Ministerialists against 180 of all shades of opposition. As the Italian parties, however, suffer from an apparently incurable disease, to which "groups" is the best name that can be given, the election returns give no adequate idea of what the Ministerial strength will be when Parliament meets. The issue before the electors is nominally between the Left and Right, but then there are two "groups" in the Left, and Cairoli was overthrown by one of them combining with the Right, and of course he will be exposed to this danger again. Party discipline is still too weak in the Italian Parliament, and will continue to be until the voters punish members who desert their party without some reasonable and openly definable excuse.

The French Ministry has also been suffering from "groups." The bill regulating the right of public meeting gave the Commis-

sary of Police the right of dissolving meetings under certain circumstances, and to this a portion of the Left moved an amendment which compelled the withdrawal of the offending section, and wounded the Ministry sufficiently to lead to the resignation of M. Lepère, the Minister of the Interior and of Public Worship. This is another illustration of the heterogeneousness of French cabinets, for it is said that the Ministry will be strengthened by his retirement, while he is alleged to have derived his strength mainly from Gambetta's favor.

The Porte has just had its first experience of the difference the change of Ministry in England is going to make to it. The Albanians were undoubtedly allowed to occupy the territory which the Turks had to surrender to the Montenegrins by a trick. The Turkish commander was bound by the convention to give the Montenegrin officer twenty-four hours' notice of his intention to evacuate his positions. He only gave six hours' notice, and the result was that the Montenegrin general was not able to reach them in time and with force enough to prevent the Albanians taking possession of them. As matters then stood, without the interference of the Powers the Montenegrins would have to conquer the ceded territory with great loss of life. The Turk, having had much experience of the delay which can be got out of the appointment of a commission of enquiry, gravely proposed that an international commission should be appointed to look into the business and see who was to blame. The Powers have, however, had enough of this. Italy and Austria have called on the Porte in a joint note to surround the disputed territory by a cordon of troops and see that it is forthwith evacuated by the Albanians, and England and France and Germany are supporting the demand. The chances are that the Turks will now say that they have not force enough for the job, unless they are frightened by the prospect of a foreign occupation. Mr. Goschen is on his way to Constantinople, and one of the signs of the alarm produced by his coming is that Osman Pasha, the Minister of War and hero of Plevna, has resigned. He was one of the most ignorant, brutal, fanatical, and corrupt of the Pashas, and the only one who of late has secured the punctual payment of his enormous salary. This he did by stationing a stout sergeant at the door of the Treasury on the first of each month with orders to seize all money coming in until his own dues were made up.

The latest news from China seems to leave little doubt that the war party at Peking has gained the ascendancy, and that war with Russia about Kuldja has been determined on, and, as a beginning, the ambassador Chung How, who negotiated the late treaty at St. Petersburg, and who has been in prison ever since, is to have his head cut off. As the hostility to Russia is only part of a general hostility to foreigners, some little anxiety seems to prevail among the foreigners at the Treaty ports. The principal fighting will, of course, be in Central Asia, and there seems to be no accurate information current as to the forces which either combatant can there bring into play. The Russian available force is known to be small, from the failure and recent slackness of the operations against the Tekke-Turkomans, and that of the Chinese is probably large, but how large nobody seems competent to say. The army which defeated Yakub Beg was certainly a formidable one, and the chances are that it has been increased and improved. If it should inflict a check on the Russians, or the Russians, through fear of a check, should for a time flinch from engaging it, the loss of prestige in the eyes of the Turkomans might be a very serious matter. That the war party really "mean business"—or, in other words, see clearly the seriousness of their undertaking—is shown in the announcement that they will continue to accept the services of foreigners in the army and navy. The London *Economist* foresees serious inconvenience both to the other European states and to the United States from the probable blockade of the Chinese ports by the Russian cruisers.

## MR. SHERMAN'S FINANCIAL PROGRAMME.

MR. SHERMAN'S speech at the dinner of the Chamber of Commerce last week was doubly important as coming not only from the Secretary of the Treasury, but from a prominent candidate for the Presidency. It touched, too, on the two most important financial topics of the day, and indeed we may say the two most important topics of the day—the legal tender question and the silver question. There are nearly \$350,000,000 of promissory notes of the Government afloat. What is to be done with them? Are they to be kept afloat wholly or in part? Is the Government to take up the business of a bank of issue as one of its permanent functions, and, if so, under what conditions? There are \$68,000,000 of silver coin in the Treasury vaults, and the quantity is increasing. What is to be done with this amount? Is it to be allowed to go on increasing under the present law? If not, what is to be done with it? Nobody is more competent to answer these questions than Mr. Sherman as Secretary of the Treasury, and nobody is under a stronger obligation to answer them fully and explicitly than a leading candidate for the Presidency who has made a specialty of public finance. We make bold to say that any man who aspires to the Presidency during the coming four years is bound not only to have matured opinions on these two subjects, but to put them before the voters with as much lucidity and frankness as he has at command. Here is what Mr. Sherman said on the first of them:

"A sound currency is one of the chief blessings of any country. But what is a sound currency? Is it one of gold, or is it of gold and silver, or is it one of either or both metals, supplemented by paper money issued by the Government or by private corporations? I take it that you mean by a sound currency a mixed currency of both coin and paper. But few in our day would be willing to dispense with paper money. It is as necessary in modern commerce as bills of exchange and drafts, but it must always be redeemable and promptly redeemed on demand. In this sense our paper money, since January 1, 1879, has been a sound currency. . . . I am one of those who believe that a portion of this paper money can properly and profitably be issued by the Government, but it should be carefully limited in amount and so guarded by coin reserves that it will be, without doubt or question, always maintained at par. And this paper dollar should have no false pretence about it. It should be what it purports to be, a promise to pay money and nothing more, depending for its credit and value only upon the sure and prompt fulfilment of that promise on demand. We want no 'fiat' money; but we want coin and paper money that rests upon the secured promise of the Government or of corporations that it can be converted into coin when needed."

Now, there is probably nobody in the United States who has given any attention to the subject, barring only a few of the more excitable and irrational Greenbackers, who would dissent from this definition of a "sound currency." A sound currency is, beyond all question, "a mixed currency of coin and paper," the paper being "always redeemable and promptly redeemed on demand." Mr. Sherman, however, must mean by redemption in coin on demand redemption in coin as valuable in the markets of the world as the sum expressed on the face of the note. He does not mean redeemable in *any* coin, or in coin of uncertain value, or coin which, though nominally of the value expressed on the face of the note, would really not bear in the market the value thus expressed. When he says, therefore, that "in this sense our paper money since January 1, 1879, has been a sound currency," he puzzles every one who has followed his financial utterances and who watches the financial phenomena of the day. Our paper money is since January 1, 1879, redeemable in two kinds of coin, one of which is twelve or fourteen per cent. less valuable than the other in the great markets of the world, and fluctuates in value from day to day; that is to say, if I take fifty dollars in paper for redemption to the Treasury, Mr. Sherman may at his discretion either give me for it fifty dollars in gold, which will be worth fifty dollars everywhere, or give me fifty dollars in silver, which will be only worth forty-four dollars everywhere. Therefore, it is impossible for me, as long as twelve per cent. of the value of my paper is dependent on his discretion, to call the United States paper a sound currency. Paper money which depends for its value in the

hands of the holder on any man's discretion is not a "sound currency" in any sense of the term. It is true Mr. Sherman has used this discretion thus far honorably. He has not paid any note-holder against his will in depreciated coin; but he has warned the country within the past year that this discretion, which is all that now stands between the note-holders and a serious fall in the value of the Government paper, is passing away from him, and certainly will pass away unless the existing law compelling the coinage of \$2,000,000 of silver a month is repealed. He has during the past winter pointed out clearly that we must stop coining silver, or to the single silver standard we shall surely come before long.

A currency whose future is clouded with this uncertainty cannot be called safe or sound. A sound currency is one the value of which in the future is not likely to be affected by any but commercial causes, such as the opening of rich mines or great improvements in production. Our paper money at present resembles the coinage of a barbarous nation whose ruler keeps threatening to adulterate it, and has the power to do so. Mr. Sherman, it is true, recognizes this difficulty in the situation. He declares that

"our dollar may be of either gold or silver, or both; but, if of both, a dollar of either must contain enough grains to be equal in value to a dollar of the other. Two yardsticks of unequal length will not answer among honest merchants. The sticks may be made of any kind of material, but they must measure alike. If the dollar in silver is not equal to the dollar in gold in market value, you must put more grains in the silver dollar or less in the gold dollar. As a great commercial and creditor nation, we want the best and the highest standard. We should lose money as well as credit by depreciating our standard of value. We could now convert our \$68,000,000 of silver coin and bullion lying uncalled-for in the Treasury into silver coin of equal market value to gold coin, dollar for dollar, at a cost not greater than the so-called profit we have already derived from coining it. One month's surplus revenue will secure this result. We cannot have a sound currency until it is settled that the gold dollar and the silver dollar shall be of equal intrinsic or market value."

Now, as everybody, or nearly everybody, knows, the difficulty of the bi-metallie coinage problem lies, and has always lain, in the fact that although you may on a given day issue gold and silver dollars of equal market value, you cannot keep them equal in market value. On the day after, gold may rise or silver may fall. In the course of a year one of these two things is almost certain to happen. If this were not true the advocates of a single standard would not have a word to say for themselves. The leading bi-metallists propose to meet this difficulty by an agreement between all commercial nations which shall give silver coin a fixed and unvarying relation to gold coin, and *vice versa*. Monometallists say this plan would not be efficacious, but all admit that no other would. Under these circumstances, one reads with amazement Mr. Sherman's proposal to solve the problem by making the silver dollar equal in value to the gold dollar *now* by enlarging the former. He does not say one word about the contingency that it would not stay equal, or make any suggestion for keeping it equal, and yet his speech was made to the Chamber of Commerce, or its leading members—or, in other words, to an audience every one of whom was aware that his plan would prove futile.

Coming to his second proposition, that a portion of the paper money of the country "can be properly and profitably issued by the Government, but it should be carefully limited in amount, and so guarded by coin reserves that it will be without doubt or question always maintained at par," we find the same vagueness and uncertainty. We venture to say that no financier in the world will deny the assertion that Government paper money, limited in amount and guarded by coin reserves in the manner described, could be both properly and profitably issued. This is about as harmless a proposition and as indisputable as that it is good for most men to be raised above want. What the country wishes to hear from Mr. Sherman is how he would provide and maintain this limit in amount, and how he would keep up the coin reserves to the desired amount. What the opponents of Government issues of paper say is, that the means of making these issues safe does not



exist; that Congress would be constantly tempted to enlarge the amount of the paper and use the coin reserves for other purposes than redemption, and would occasionally give way to the temptation. A financier who talks on this question is bound before all things to give us reasons for believing that this apprehension is not well founded. The course of Congress with regard to the currency during the last fifteen years, and the doctrines which have taken root among many politicians of both parties, and have found expression in party platforms, touching the powers of Government over money, have rightly or wrongly brought the most thoughtful portion of the business community to the conclusion that Congress cannot be trusted with the control of the currency. In order to shake this conclusion it is not enough to say that a safe Government paper currency would be a good thing. What the commercial world wishes to know is how in a political community like this such a currency could be made safe. A speech from Mr. Sherman on this point would be a very valuable contribution to the literature of the coming campaign, and we trust he will either make one or issue a pamphlet containing his views on the subject from his Literary Bureau.

#### THE MORAL OF THE WHITTAKER CASE.

THE Whittaker case may be said to have closed with the report of the experts to which we have referred elsewhere. It ought not to be dismissed, however, as a vulgar and unsuccessful attempt at imposture on the part of an audacious young rogue. It will long retain a good deal of interest and importance as an illustration of certain peculiar conditions of popular sentiment, which the historian will perhaps in no way be so well able to describe as by calling attention to the demonstrations which the trial has called forth. There can hardly be a doubt that the fraud was suggested to Whittaker by the numerous evidences which he met with or had heard of, if not of a certain demand for such outrages as that which he perpetrated on himself, at least of a great readiness on the part of the public to believe in their occurrence, and, indeed, of a kind of cultivated credulity with regard to them. He told one of the detectives last week that it was perhaps the work of some colored man for political effect.

How shrewd he was in his calculation the result proved. The news of what had happened in his room had no sooner spread over the country than he, a poor, unknown, and, as it now appears, by no means interesting or ingenuous lad, backward in his studies, and with few of the mental or moral qualities which fit a man for a soldier's profession, became almost in a single day a popular hero. Congress became excited over him, and threats of the abolition of the School in which he suffered wrong were uttered in the Senate. The press took up his cause with great zeal and virulence. Political conventions gave him a place in their platforms. Letters began to pour in on him by the dozen containing offers of sympathy and support. Thousands of people who had never before seen or heard of him became his warm friends, ready to help him with their purses, labor, and time. Nor was this all. It was assumed that the officers of the Academy, some of them men of high standing and of long and honorable service, were in a league against him, seeking his ruin and conniving at the persecution of him by his brother cadets. The brother cadets, too, were denounced *en masse*, as undoubtedly capable of the outrage on him although the proof might not be forthcoming, and the officers of the School were accused of deliberate attempts to prevent the production of this proof. One lawyer and United States District-Attorney went to West Point to look into the matter, and walked towards a public house, to which it was reported and believed the cadets were in the habit of repairing to hatch criminal designs. On the way he saw, or thought he saw, two men coming along the road on horseback. He concluded at once that they were United States officers engaged in pursuing and watching him, and, in order to throw them off the scent, he sat down and began—to whittle a stick. This tale was actually telegraphed to the press as an illustration of the despera-

tion with which the authorities of the Academy were endeavoring to shield Whittaker's assailants. Another United States District-Attorney came on the ground by order of the Government, and at once assumed that these authorities were, while nominally conducting an enquiry under the procedure fixed by military law, really engaged in an attempt to conceal a crime, and proceeded to insult and inveigh against them on this assumption.

If all this had occurred *after* investigation there would have been nothing very remarkable or discreditable about it, but it occurred before investigation; it occurred before the public had any accurate knowledge of the facts, and before it knew anything of Whittaker's character. In fact, nothing certain about him was known except that the white cadets avoided his company, and it was assumed in the teeth of experience that all those who avoided his company because of his color were not only capable of breaking into his room, choking him into insensibility and gashing his ears, but were likely to do these things; the fact being that immunity from "devilling" and "hazing" is, it appears, one of the accompaniments or signs of the colored cadet's isolation. More than this, doubting his story, even in the presence of the strong air of improbability created by the facts, was for two or three weeks treated by many good people as an indication of sympathy with such deeds as he reported, and of hostility to the colored race. As the excitement grew, this conclusion was made to cover more ground, and a sceptical attitude towards the Whittaker case became presumptive evidence of dislike to the results of the war and all that this term implies. We have no doubt that so deep is the impression he has made by his very clumsy tale that thousands will refuse to be convinced by any evidence which can be brought against him. We have heard of one lady who declared that she would not believe him guilty even if he confessed. We have met a very intelligent man who believed that the evidence both of the doctors and of the experts in handwriting was simply part of the general conspiracy to ruin him, in which all the white men at West Point were engaged.

It is difficult when one sees this condition of the public mind to avoid considering Whittaker a sort of genius. It argued genius in a boy of his years to perceive that a vast store of mingled credulity and sympathy could be drawn upon for his benefit by the very simple process of making himself seem the victim of an apparently cruel, but in reality very trifling, assault. But the main interest of the incident lies in the light it throws back on the political history of the past ten years. Probably nothing has during that period so powerfully influenced American politics as the belief of the people of the North that the Southern whites were in the habit of committing outrages on the negroes on a great scale. That the Southern whites did commit a great many is unhappily true, but the number really committed would, if known, probably never have seemed anything more formidable than the unavoidable concomitants of a great social revolution, or have been treated as anything more than a sign of passing barbarism, like the violence in the mining regions. What gave outrages a great political influence, and made them the principal support for many years of some leading Northern politicians, was the exaggeration of their numbers and the embellishment of their incidents, into which both black and white politicians at the South were tempted by discovering the extent of Northern credulity with regard to them, and the feverish impatience with which the Northern public treated any doubt about them, or any demand for ordinary proof of them. And yet there was probably hardly one that did not need investigation. Stories of what occurred in remote parts of a region so thinly settled as the South would need close investigation anywhere. They needed it doubly when emanating from people with very low moral standards, and beset by very strong temptations to lie. In fact, most stories of outrages ought not to have been accepted, as the Whittaker case shows, without some knowledge of the character of the alleged victim and of the other witnesses. In most cases they were accepted without any sifting of testimony at all, on the mere word of somebody who wrote to the

newspapers. In some cases lists of murders, from one hundred to two thousand, were used on the stump, without names or dates, as having occurred in certain States, or within certain periods in divers States, and without any good reason for believing them beyond the fact that what was reported of the relations of the whites with the colored people made it seem probable that the former would freely murder the latter. One newspaper of high standing in this city published, without note or comment, a letter from a correspondent, alleging that Christmas day, election day, and, if we remember rightly, the Fourth of July, were in some parts of the South set apart by the whites for the murder of negroes, and were spent exclusively in this barbarous pastime.

Now, it is undoubtedly true that it is the prejudice against color and the wrongs inflicted on the colored race which have produced this great disturbance of the popular judgment in favor of color. But it would be well for those who find themselves wildly credulous with regard to injuries suffered by colored people, to remember that fanatical disregard of the rules of evidence for the benefit of color is as senseless as fanatical prejudice against color. There are plenty of facts which may be cited in support of each; but the friends of color have a distinct object in view, which its foes have not. They seek the elevation of the colored race, and it is worth their while to consider now seriously whether the time has not come when the negro himself will be benefited by their assuming a more judicial frame of mind with regard to him. All his legal disabilities have been removed. Abundant means of education are open to him. He is secured in the possession of all the money he can make, and all the honors he can win. In fact, he has become the pet of a large and influential portion of the community. Is it not time, therefore, to make him stand fairly and squarely on his own feet, and kill the prejudice against him in the only way in which prejudice is ever killed—by quality and performance? A state of public feeling which tempts a morbid youth at a military school either to escape uncongenial society or a puzzling examination by slashing himself and bringing false accusations against his comrades, and which comes near rewarding him with success, can hardly be called a healthy one. There are not many white men whose character would not be broken down by being surrounded by such fierce presumptions on the part of a large portion of the community as those which for a while converted Whittaker into a martyr. They constitute a standing incentive to fraud and deception and inertia. Nor, let us add, is the conscience of any one in a healthy state to-day who regrets that the detection of one tricky rascal in a gross imposture should have delivered four hundred young men from an odious suspicion, and yet we fear there are many—and not politicians either—to whom this detection has come as a painful disappointment.

#### BISMARCK'S DIFFICULTY WITH THE REICHSTAG.

BERLIN, May 4.

LAST week the debates and resolutions of the Reichstag offered more than the usual interest. All over the country two very important matters occupied general attention. The one was the Samoa bill, the other the interpellation as to the Government's new schemes in connection with the threatened attack upon the sovereignty of the free city of Hamburg. In both cases Bismarck's policy suffered a signal defeat.

As to Samoa, or, to use the official designation, as to the governmental support of the German South Sea Trading Company (*Seehandelsgesellschaft*), for the first time in many years a hitherto obsequious majority opposed the Chancellor's plans, and even the Conservatives did not fully obey his orders. German shipping merchants, as you know, about twenty years ago established a flourishing interinsular trade in the South Pacific. The leaders, of about ten large German firms, were the Messrs. Godeffroy, of Hamburg, who, on account of their prominence and liberality, were called the kings of the South Sea, and had their principal establishments, plantations, and warehouses on the Samoa Islands, of Steinberger notoriety. They imported all kinds of German and English goods, and exported tropical products, especially copra, which is an excellent ingredient for soap and oil manufactures. Last year the Godeffroys failed, not in the course of their legitimate business, but in conse-

quence of bad speculations in mining and other fancy stocks. The high personal character of the gentlemen composing the firm, which is nearly a hundred years old; the generosity with which, in the days of their success, they had founded institutions of learning and patronized exploring expeditions; and the importance of their house to the foreign trade, enlisted the sympathies of all Germany in their misfortune. When in 1878 their first difficulties began, they succeeded in forming a shareholders' company at Hamburg, with a capital of five millions of marks (about \$1,300,000), but they could only dispose of one million, and remained in possession of the balance. In 1879 new difficulties arose, whereupon new shares were issued to the creditors and mortgaged on their Samoa plantations. Among the creditors were the Messrs. Baring, of London, with a claim of £135,000. About the assets of the Godeffroys no positive data have been published. It is, however, calculated that they amount to some eight to ten millions of marks. Suffice it to state that the troubles of the house increased, and that finally, last winter, it did not have the means to pay its acceptances of 1,200,000 marks. A few months ago the German Government, induced by some large Hamburg houses, took an interest in the continuation of the Samoa establishment, caused a new company to be formed with a capital of ten millions of marks, and promised a guaranty of three per cent. for twenty years on such capital, provided that on or before May 1 the Reichstag should sanction the agreement and furnish the necessary funds. The amount of the acceptances was to be paid immediately, and would be lost if the bill were rejected by the Reichstag. The financial agent of the Government, the Prussian Trading Company, which has been and still is at the head of the syndicates for placing the Prussian and German loans, managed the execution of the plan, and easily persuaded its friends to participate in the company, holding out as a threat that foreign Powers would swallow the great establishments created by German intellect and energy. Bismarck himself signed a letter appealing to the patriotic feelings of the public and soliciting subscriptions to a national enterprise, which "guarantees only three per cent.," in order, as the letter says, "to prevent wild speculation on 'Change'!" Thus far all was well, and the necessary sums were soon subscribed; but the Reichstag, on April 27, by 128 votes against 112, refused to ratify the promise of the Government. Consequently the scarcely-created company has lost its 1,200,000 marks, and must go into liquidation.

The bill was chiefly defeated by the able speeches of Deputies Bamberger and H. H. Meier. The latter is one of the leading German merchants, president of the North German Lloyd, and the senior partner of a large Bremen shipping-house. While the exposition of the representatives of the Government was rather given to sentimental phraseology and poetic exaggerations, and their assertions did not contain any proof, except some hearsay evidence of marine captains and German consuls, Mr. Meier proved that the investment was in every respect unprofitable, and wrong in principle as well as in its effects; showed that both England and the United States had rejected the offer of annexing Samoa; and nobly protested against the support of a mercantile enterprise by the Government, as leading to the demoralization of the merchant and to the ruin of trade. The speeches of Mr. Bamberger were of even a higher order. He is not only an experienced merchant, having been at the head of a large Paris banking-house, but one of our most prominent political thinkers and economists. By the philosophical training of his mind, his scholarship, his essays on banking and the gold standard, his pamphlets on the great political questions of the day, he ranks among our leading public men. Besides, Mr. Bamberger is a ready debater, who joins sarcasm and wit with a great positive knowledge of facts. Thus it was easy for him to destroy every statement of the imperial commissioners, among whom especially Mr. Reuleaux, just returned from the Sidney Exhibition, made a very poor figure. Mr. Bamberger denounced the bill as an anachronism and quixotic in all its particulars. He declared most emphatically and eloquently that the German people neither needs nor wants colonies nor protectorates over foreign islands, and that still more it detests Governmental Socialism, which benefits some people out of the pockets of other people, and which in principle is no better than the wildest dreams of a red Socialist. If German trade and German merchants command the respect of the civilized world, it is chiefly on account of their never having claimed Government protection, and of having grown by their own exertions. There is, for instance, no German steamship line that has ever applied for subsidies. Even the new protective era will not be powerful enough to uproot these cherished convictions and honorable traditions.

A still more important matter than the defeat of the Samoa bill is the



motion laid before the Federal Council (Bundesrath) by Prussia, asking for the annexation of the city of Altona with a part of the Hamburg suburb, St. Pauli, to the Zollverein. The cities of Hamburg and Altona adjoin, and both are free ports. Altona is Prussian and has some 60,000 inhabitants; Hamburg is a sovereign Hanse Town with more than 300,000 inhabitants. As to their commercial importance, they rank like Brooklyn and New York. Bismarck, in forcing his protective policy on Germany, desires to and must include Altona in the Zollverein, in order to prevent smuggling, as his organs say, but, in fact, for the purpose of collecting more duties and of compelling Hamburg to follow Altona. The proposed measure aims to draw a boundary-line between Hamburg and Prussia. St. Pauli lies just between Hamburg and Altona, and is the headquarters of the Hamburg sailors. It is the seat of several ocean steam-navigation companies—as, for instance, the packet line to New York—of the observatory, of sugar-refineries, breweries, large stores and warehouses. According to a statement recently made, there pass every minute of the day, on the average, two hundred persons and ten carriages and carts through the principal thoroughfare between Hamburg and St. Pauli. To take the latter from the former and submit it to another system of customs is about the same thing as to declare New York a free port with the exception of the three lower wards of the city. Hamburg (just like Bremen) owes her wealth and prosperity to her exceptional position as a free port, which has been solemnly guaranteed to her by the imperial constitution. According to Article 34, Hamburg and Bremen remain free ports outside of the boundary-line of the Zollverein until they move for admission into the latter. Their commerce is, of course, of general German importance; attacking Hamburg, therefore, means injuring the vital interests of Germany. Under the present high protective tariff Hamburg is less than ever inclined to avail herself of her vested right, but Bismarck, without asking the consent of the authorities of the city, assumes a non-existing constitutional power over Hamburg, and provokes indignation even among those of her citizens who thus far have been his staunchest friends. His Commissioner in the Reichstag haughtily admitted the designs of his master, and, instead of answering the interpellant, sneeringly added that they were an internal affair of the Federal Council, which did not concern the Reichstag.

"Affairs here," writes a friend of mine, a patriotic Hamburg citizen, "begin to assume a very serious shape. The exasperation against Bismarck finally endangers the Empire, as it fortifies all the centrifugal tendencies of state sovereignty. Our Senate is, of course, indignant at the 'crimen læsæ majestatis,' and mentally sees itself degraded to the magistracy of an insignificant inland town. When, about twenty years ago, Hanover objected to the building of a bridge over the Elbe, all the world cried contemptuously about the nuisance of petty principalities; but now? It may be that real unity can be achieved only by one despotic will, which, undivided by party strife, knows how to carry its point. We all know that Bismarck wants to increase and strengthen the power of the Empire; we therefore doubly deplore that he destroys his own work."

The general question is now, whether the Federal Council will do what Bismarck directs it to do. If the law be broken to a free city, why not in the same way to any duchy or kingdom or any other member of the Empire? If Bismarck in the case of Hamburg can, like Jackson, interpret the Constitution according to his understanding, can he not as well extend this interpretation to princes and kings? Not a single member of the Reichstag defended the constitutionality of the Chancellor's proceedings; on the contrary, all were unanimous that without the consent of Hamburg not the smallest particle can be taken from her territory. I apprehend, however, that the Federal Council, out of subserviency for its master, will not dare to protect the constitutional right of our greatest commercial community. "When they see," a member of the council of his colleagues remarked the other day, "Bismarck's white cuirassier cap hanging on the wall of the anteroom they forget all their plucky intentions and most obediently eat dust." In the meantime matters go on in Hamburg as if there were only one will in the Empire. Prussian customs-officers receive their orders and instructions directly from the Berlin Foreign Office, and are forced to carry through the annexation of St. Pauli. Mr. Boetticher, the Oberpraesident of Schleswig-Holstein, the adjoining Prussian province, and Mr. Wenzel, the Prussian minister at Hamburg, are willing tools in Bismarck's hands; they direct and control the custom-house collector, who has expressly been sent to Altona for the specific purpose of creating an accomplished fact.

Since the opening of the present session the Reichstag has not yet seen the Chancellor. He never goes out, receives the Emperor and the several princes at his house, entertains his friends, takes his daily walks in his garden, which is surrounded by high walls, and makes his commu-

nications through his subordinates, who never muster so much courage as to make even a modest objection. The natural consequence is that there is much delay and loss of time, that business stagnates, that no plan in the direction of public affairs is laid out, and that, in spite of the most earnest endeavors, no satisfactory result can be attained. Bismarck wants to have everything for himself and to do everything himself, which is simply impossible. To conclude with an historical parallel: Germany in her present state of mind feels like Prussia in the last days of the reign of Frederic II. The immortal merits of the king and the great success of his foreign policy were overlooked on account of his narrow-minded home policy, of the annoying chicanery of his customs-officers, and of the clumsiness of his dependent subordinates, who interfered everywhere and kept the machine running, but suppressed all individual life. ? ?

#### RAILROADS AND BRIGANDAGE IN SICILY.

PALERMO, April 29.

RAILROADS are great instruments of contrast. I have just made the run from Paris to Naples and Sicily without stopping anywhere, except at Bologna for a day; and coming directly from Naples to Palermo, I find myself in a country which in the last century, and even at the beginning of the present, seemed almost inaccessible to a Frenchman. A railway is in course of construction from Palermo to Trapani; it is not yet open to the public, but I was, by special permission, taken over a great part of the line, and nothing can equal the beauty of the scenery of this Sicilian coast. The railway runs from Palermo between the sea and the great marble mountains which surround the island. These places are all familiar to me, but I was charmed to see in a rapid succession, and like a changing panorama, the Favorita, where I once liked to gather the wild roses growing freely everywhere; the little islands called *Isole delle Femine*, with their ruined towers built in old times against the Saracens; the huge marmorean cliffs, which seem like gigantic pedestals for the temples of the gods; the little coast towns, which look at a distance like the towns of Algeria, with their terraces and their white walls, in which there is only one door and one window. Half-naked children were seen, browned by the sun, in picturesque attitudes; the peasants at work in the fields looked with astonishment at the little locomotive dragging only two cars, and gliding over the new line. The oxen, the goats themselves seemed surprised. The road was not difficult to build: there is all along the coast a flat little plain, which makes a natural platform between the sea and the mountain; there are only here and there small viaducts or bridges over torrents. I was told by the chief engineer that the road will not cost more than \$25,000 a kilometre. The land was not dear, and the juries of "expropriation," or damages, which are formed nearly as they are in France, are not yet accustomed to levy blackmail on the railway companies, as they are doing in some parts of France, especially in the south, where they fix extortionate prices on the land which becomes necessary to the great railway companies.

A visit to the temple of Segestum, which used to be a great affair before the railroad was constructed, will now become much easier, as there is a station near Alcamo, which is not far from the temple. After the ruins of Girgenti, of Syracuse, and of Taormina, there are none in the island which better deserve a visit. Instead of stopping first at Alcamo, you can stop also at Partenico, the reputed birth-place of the famous Lays. All these villages look like Arab towns; they are clusters of white houses, and have a severe appearance. Alcamo is a name which dates from the time of the domination of the Saracens; the old olive-trees, with their quaint trunks, which have been cut a hundred times and which have the most extraordinary forms, are still called here the *Saraceni*, and are said to have been planted in the time of the Saracens. The peasants used to wear the vulgar Norman cotton night-cap, and, indeed, we saw it in use by the workmen at the unfinished stations. The traces of all the successive invasions are to be seen everywhere; but, on the whole, the country has eminently what may be called a Grecian look: the immense olive-groves, the mountains, the large herds of goats or of oxen, the sky, the names of many places, all recall the times when the Greek colonies were flourishing in the island. There is a certain sort of impropriety between the whistle and noise of the locomotive and the Olympian calm of the scenery. You cannot help thinking of Theocritus, of Virgil; you would not be much surprised to see a fawn appear behind a hedge, or nymphs dancing on the soft turf under the pale-green olive branches.

With all its natural richness the country is poor, owing to many causes, which it would take too long to explain in detail. Only a few years ago it was still in a feudal state. When the Normans invaded the island

they divided all the land into three parts; they gave a third of it to the Church, they kept a third of it, and allowed the people to keep the rest in copyhold. The great estates of the conquerors were soon let in other copyholds; the peasants continued to till the land, to plant the olive-tree or the vine, but they ceased to be proprietors; they are even now *censitarii*—that is to say, they pay the lord of the land a perpetual rent, but they have no property even in the trees which they plant. They have no interest in the improvement of the land. This state of things is slowly changing; after the revolutions which made the new Italy, the lands of the Church, which in Sicily were enormous, were confiscated and sold; a law was passed which allowed the copyholders to buy the freehold of the land at a rate which was very favorable to them; the *censo*, which is generally very low, as it is very ancient, was capitalized at five per cent., and the payment could be made in Italian five per cent. stock, taken at par; at the time when the law was passed the Italian stocks were very much below par, and they are still so, though they have risen greatly. Nothing was wanted in order to give full effect to this law but a national bank which could make loans to the copyholders and help them to buy the freehold; but the most intelligent proprietors have themselves helped the peasants—they have made allotments in their own estates, and diminished the area of their copyholds. In the course of time it may be expected that the peasants in Sicily will become small proprietors. The nature of the country is eminently favorable to direct proprietorship; the plain of Castellamare is like a vast garden, where nothing is seen but olive trees and vineyards.

Progress, however, is very slow in these southern countries; everything here is still as it was when I made my last visit. Last night I heard an improvisatore, an old man who works all day in the fields at the rate of twenty-five cents a day, who never eats any meat, and who lives entirely, like all the "hands" in this country, on oil, bread, and wine. This old peasant spoke for more than an hour; he improvised—that is to say, he made variations on the old themes of the Romance novels; he spoke of the siege of Jerusalem, of Vespasian, of the destruction of the Holy City, of the Crusades, of Ruggiero, of Pieramante, of Saladin, of Saint-Denis of France. All these stories of battles, of duels between Christian knights and huge Saracenic giants, form a sort of ground on which the minstrel can work almost *ad infinitum*. I could not help admiring the ease, the *naïveté*, the diction of this poor old laborer; he spoke, and spoke for ever, and there was always a new torrent to be crossed, a new queen to be delivered, a new duel to be fought. The attendants of the estate had all been allowed to enter the great hall when the improvisatore spoke; and the children had gone to sleep under the monotonous music of the improvisation; the men and women continued to give full attention; they heard these stories of chivalry, as the French say, with all their ears. The old man went on and on, and I understood better than I had ever done how traditions are kept alive in semi-barbarous countries; how so many poems, how the 'Odyssey' has come down to us through centuries. The legend is impressed in the popular mind by the poet; the improvisatore does not really improvise, he simply piles words, without end, on the legend.

You can hardly speak of Sicily without speaking of brigandage. I am told that the island has never been as free from it as it is now; the railways will be fatal to this old institution, and will do more against it than all the *carabinieri* and *bersaglieri*. There is one now between Palermo and Girgenti; the connection between this line and another line which goes from the centre of the island to the eastern shore is not yet made; you have to take a carriage and to spend three hours in it in order to join the latter. This point is still a dangerous place, a "scandalous" place, to use the Sicilian word. A sum amounting to \$30,000 was taken a few weeks ago on its way to the railway officers. A fortnight ago there was a great trial at Palermo of a band of twenty-two *ladroni*, and three of them were condemned to death. They will probably not be executed; there has been no capital execution in Sicily for a number of years. When the Italian unity was achieved the code of Tuscany, which prohibited capital punishment, became practically the code of all Italy with regard to crimes. There is a great movement now in Italy towards the practical re-establishment of capital punishment; but so far the Sicilian brigands have had the benefit of the mildness of the Tuscan code. The story of Leone, the famous brigand, and of an Englishman named Rose, has been made known everywhere. Mr. Rose was taken by Leone as a hostage, and his family were obliged to give Leone \$20,000 in order to save him. Leone was the last famous brigand in the island; he was a man of some education, and had been, I am told, an officer in the wars of independence. He had an American earline in the style of a revolver, which

made him very dangerous. He was excessively brave, and he was all alone when he captured Mr. Rose, who had a number of people round him at the time. He was finally surrounded in a cornfield by a detachment of soldiers, who shot into the centre of the field as long as they saw anything move. When there was no longer any motion they entered the field and found Leone dead. Let us hope that he will not soon have a successor. In the interior of the island there are regions where the brigands are much more powerful than on the coast. I am told that they are levying blackmail on all the *curatoli*, the agents of the landlords who live at Palermo, and that there are parts where the landlords dare not go in person, for fear of being seized. The *curatoli* represent the state of things in very black colors, in order to pay as little as possible to the landlords. The brigands in these regions are really only tax-gatherers, who levy taxes after the state. Under such conditions, it is not to be wondered at if the interior is in a very barbarous state. No progress is possible where property is not safe, and where there is a whole class of people who live by rapine.

## Correspondence.

### A BLAINE MEETING IN CHICAGO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There was a clattering of chairs on the hard floor of the reading-room in the Grand Pacific Hotel, and a sudden movement towards the hall occupied by the Young Men's Blaine Club. Mr. Eugene Hale, of Maine, had arrived fresh from the dull campaign in Michigan to impart his enthusiasm to the young volunteers in Illinois. I did not take notes at the time, but after a week's travelling and meditation give a report of Mr. Hale's speech from memory and to the best of my ability:

"I am glad to meet the young men of Chicago. I am in communication with the young men all over the country, and I assure you the young men are all for Mr. Blaine. It is the young men who do the work of the campaign. It is the young men like you who are to carry the coming national elections. Our candidate is the candidate of the young men. The next few days will show you that the young men who do the work of the campaign [or caucuses, I cannot remember which] are all for Mr. Blaine. Where are the young men who are not for our candidate? They are not to be found. It is young men like you who are to win in the next election. The tide is rising for our candidate, and it is a tide of young men. The young men who are not for Mr. Blaine are too few to be heard from. The young men are all in favor of our candidate. We shall hear from the young men more and more."

That was all (the speech was even devoid of statistics); but to expound this momentous theme required a full half-hour. There was no principle enunciated to fire our young blood. Our chief was not described as a statesman interested in any far-reaching plans for the good of the Republic, but simply as "our candidate." For what reason he is our candidate we have not yet been informed. Are not young men expected to have ideas?

A YOUNG REPUBLICAN.

### CONCERNING A NOTE IN DEXTER'S 'AS TO ROGER WILLIAMS.'

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* for December 25, 1879, I called attention to Note 478 in Dr. H. M. Dexter's 'As to Roger Williams.' In this note Dr. Dexter, referring to the whipping of Obadiah Holmes in Boston in 1651, says:

"Arnold thinks he was cruelly whipped [*Hist. R. I.*, i. 235]. But Clarke says: 'It was so easy to me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not'; and that he told the magistrates after it was over: 'You have struck me as with Roses' [*Ill. News*, etc., 22]. Dr. Palfrey suspects the executioner had orders 'to vindicate what they thought the majesty of the law at little cost to the delinquent' [*Hist. N. Eng.*, ii. 353]."

As I showed in my former letter, the words quoted in this note are not the words of Clarke, but of Holmes. Since Dr. Dexter's attention was called to this fact he has made three attempts to correct the note. In the *Congregationalist* of August 1, 1877, he made this statement:

"I said Clarke because I meant Clarke, as I was referring in general to Clarke's book [*Ill. News*], which contained Holmes's letter. The oversight which I committed was in neglecting to add in parenthesis the name 'Holmes' after 'he,' thus: 'and that he (Holmes) told,' etc."

The note as thus amended read:

"Arnold thinks he was 'cruelly whipped' [*Hist. R. I.*, i. 235]. But



Clarke says: 'It was so easy to me, that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not'; and that he (Holmes) told the magistrates after it was over: 'You have struck me as with Roses' [*Ill. News*, etc., 22]."

Two years later Dr. Dexter again explained this error in names. He said:

"In citing from Clarke's *Ill. News from New England*, etc., the author [of 'As to Roger Williams'] wrote: 'Clarke says, 'It was so easy to me that I could well bear it, etc.,' when he should have written, 'Clarke makes Holmes say, 'It was so easy to me that I could well bear it,' Holmes being the party concerned, and not Clarke, who was describing what occurred."

The note as thus amended read:

"Arnold thinks he was 'cruelly whipped' [*Hist. R. I.*, i. 235]. But Clarke makes Holmes say: 'It was so easy to me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not'; and that he told the magistrates after it was over: 'You have struck me as with Roses' [*Ill. News*, etc., 22]."

As I showed in the *Nation*, December 25, this emendation left the note in a more objectionable form than at the first, for Clarke was now made the garbler of Holmes's words, when, in fact, as a reference to Holmes's letter in Clarke's *Ill. News*, or Isaac Backus's *History of New England*, will show, it is Dr. Dexter himself, and not Clarke, who makes Holmes say, by omitting a part of his statement, what he did not say.

And so we have another correction of this note which appeared in the *Congregationalist* of May 5. Dr. Dexter now says: "As Holmes's letter is printed in Clarke's book, he, by a not unnatural oversight, used the phrase, 'But Clarke says,' when he meant to say, and should have written, 'But Holmes—in Clarke—says.' Beyond this he has no confession to make." The note thus amended reads:

"Arnold thinks he was 'cruelly whipped' [*Hist. R. I.*, i. 235]. But Holmes—in Clarke—says: 'It was so easy to me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not'; and that he told the magistrates after it was over: 'You have struck me as with Roses' [*Ill. News*, etc., 22]."

It would seem that a more proper citation would have been, "But Holmes, in a letter to certain prominent Baptist ministers in London, says"; but it is doubtless as much as could be expected that we have now the confession that it was Holmes who said: "It was so easy to me," etc. Beyond this, Dr. Dexter says he has no confession to make.

Now if Dr. Dexter's note, as thus amended, means anything, it is this: Arnold thinks that Holmes was "cruelly whipped"; but there is another view which one may take of this affair. Indeed, Holmes himself is a witness to the fact that the punishment was made easy by the magistrates, who sought to vindicate the majesty of the law at little cost to the delinquent. Dr. Palfrey suspects that the magistrates had orders to this effect.

Unfortunately, however, for Dr. Dexter, what Holmes said, in his letter from which the quotations in note 478 are taken, is this, the italics being my own:

"And as the man began to lay the strokes upon my back, I said to the people, 'Though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet my God would not fail.' So it pleased the Lord to come in, and so to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I broke forth praying unto the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge; and telling the people that now I found he did not fail me, and therefore now I should trust him for ever who failed me not; for in truth, as the strokes fell upon me, I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence as the like thereof I never had nor felt, nor can with fleshly tongue express; and the outward pain was so removed from me, that indeed I am not able to declare it to you; *it was so easy to me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not*, although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength (yea, spitting in his hand three times, as many affirmed) with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he had loosed me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart, and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, 'You have struck me as with roses'; and said, moreover, 'although the Lord hath made it easy for me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charge.'"

There is more than an error of names in this note. If Dr. Dexter had quoted the whole paragraph—indeed, if he had finished the sentence from which his first quotation is taken, it would have appeared that Arnold was right when he said Holmes was "cruelly whipped," while the sentence from which the second quotation is taken shows that in Holmes's view the punishment was made easy, not by the magistrates but by the Lord, who did not withhold his support in the hour of his servant's trial.

What now has Dr. Dexter to say to this charge of misrepresentation? This:

"He had no purpose himself to go into the discussion of the quality of Holmes's whipping, or to express any opinion about it, or him—except that he had just before complimented him as 'made of sterner stuff' than his colleagues. He did express none. He cited Arnold's view—which is the common one—on one side, and Dr. Palfrey's on the other, simply adding the citation from Holmes's letter which led Dr. Palfrey to suggest a judgment different from Arnold's."

Let us see. Here is the note as now amended:

"Arnold thinks he was 'cruelly whipped' [*Hist. R. I.*, i. 235]. But Holmes—in Clarke—says: 'It was so easy to me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not'; and that he told the magistrates after it was over: 'You have struck me as with Roses' [*Ill. News*, etc., 22]. Dr. Palfrey suspects the executioner had orders 'to vindicate what they thought the majesty of the law at little cost to the delinquent' [*Hist. N. Eng.*, ii. 353]."

Who is it that remarks, in opposition to Arnold, "But Holmes—in Clarke—says," if not Dr. Dexter? There is no allusion to Dr. Palfrey's view until we come to the last sentence in the note. Nor here is Dr. Dexter fair in his reference to Dr. Palfrey. What Dr. Palfrey says is this: "When he [Holmes] relates that the scourging which he endured 'was so easy that he could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not,' and that he told the magistrates, 'You have struck me as with Roses,' the reader ventures to hope that the executioner had been directed by his superiors to vindicate what they thought the majesty of the law at little cost to the delinquent." It would be considerable of a venture for the reader who has Holmes's letter before him to indulge such a hope as is here suggested. It is founded on Holmes's words, and they certainly awaken no such hope. The point, however, that is noticeable here is this, that Dr. Palfrey's phrase, "the reader ventures to hope," is magnified by Dr. Dexter into "Dr. Palfrey suspects," so that the reader is doubly misled; he is first told that Holmes himself declares that his punishment was made easy by the magistrates, and then he is told that Dr. Palfrey "suspects" that the magistrates were instructed to make the punishment easy.

I am aware that Dr. Dexter says he has no confession to make beyond that which he has already made. A recent note from one of the first historical scholars in New England is before me, in which he says: "I have read your letter in the *Nation* in reply to Dr. Dexter, and it seems to me that his course in the affair has been wholly indefensible." Unless it is defensible another confession is in order.

H. S. BURRAGE.

PORTLAND, ME., May 11, 1880.

## Notes.

J. W. BOUTON will shortly publish 'Freemasonry Older than Obelisks, Pyramids, and Mounds,' by John A. Weisse, M.D.—Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, New York, have brought out a third edition of Mr. Charles Loring Brace's 'Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work among Them,' which appeared originally in 1872. Twenty pages of a miscellaneous but kindred character have been added. The usefulness of works of warning like this will cease only with the existence of the "dangerous classes."—'The Metric System and Interchange of Weights and Measures,' a practical text book with examples, by D. Beach, jr., and E. A. Gibbens, has just been published by G. P. Putnam's Sons.—Appendix No. 15, Report of 1876 of the U. S. Coast Survey, consists of an account of "Measurements of Gravity at Initial Stations in America and Europe" undertaken by assistant C. S. Peirce—namely, through "oscillations of the same pendulum at those fundamental stations of Europe [Geneva, Paris, Berlin, and Kew] where the chief absolute determinations had been made and whence pendulum-exhibitions had set out, and at a station in America [Hoboken] which would become the initial one for this continent." A note on the theory and economy of research, Appendix 14, also by Mr. Peirce, has by application a direct connection with the foregoing experiments. The closing sentence is pungent: "It is to be remarked that the theory here given rests on the supposition that the object of the investigation is the ascertainment of truth. When an investigation is made for the purpose of attaining personal distinction, the economies of the problem are entirely different. But that seems to be well enough understood by those engaged in that sort of investigation."—In the second volume of the *American Journal of Mathematics* Mr. Peirce prints, by permission, a noteworthy paper on "A Quincuncial Projection of the Sphere," with a corresponding chart, in which the whole sphere is represented on repeating squares, the angles are exactly pre-

served, the curvature of lines representing great circles is for the most part very slight, and the exaggerations far less than in the stereographic or in Mercator's projection.—The *Dial*, "a monthly index of current literature," appears in neat shape with broad margins, and with a character of its own (Vol. i, No. 1, May, 1880, pp. 24. Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co.). It contains an interesting account of the *Dial* of Emerson and the Transcendentalists, several reviews, notes, bibliographical lists, etc. We learn from it that Mr. J. J. Lalor is at work on a translation of Dr. Ludwig Nohl's condensed biographies of the great composers prepared for the popular "Universal-Bibliothek."—The *Harvard Register* for May announces the several Harvard summer courses in science, viz., botany, chemistry, and zoology.—The Newport Historical Publishing Co. propose, if they receive sufficient support, to issue a quarterly magazine devoted to the history of that and adjacent towns. The importance of it is assured from the fact that it will be the medium of publication for Dr. Henry E. Turner's "carefully-compiled record of the births, marriages, and deaths of Newport, Middletown, and Jamestown, from the town and church records and graveyard inscriptions," to which those of Portsmouth, etc., will be added. Dr. Turner, who, by the way, will edit this periodical, has in press his "Settlers of Aquidneck."—A work on the history of Socialism in North America, by Heinrich Semler, a San Francisco German, has been published by Brockhaus.

—The first annual report of the Executive Committee of the Archaeological Institute of America has reached our table. It shows a membership of upwards of 120, and an income of about \$2,500 from this source alone. The work of the year has been the procuring from Mr. Lewis H. Morgan of an essay on the "System of Housebuilding practised by the Indians," which is printed in connection with the report; the rendering of assistance to Mr. Joseph Thacher Clarke during his explorations in the Archipelago and along the coasts of Greece and Asia Minor, as the result of which we have "Archæological Notes on Greek Shores. Part I." the second paper of the volume; and the commissioning of Mr. W. J. Stillman to visit the gigantic ruins at Monte Leone (province of Grosseto) in Italy, and make a report upon them, also printed here. The Institute is ready, during the coming year, if supplied with the requisite means, to employ a qualified agent to study the life of the village Indians in Colorado and New Mexico, and to undertake exploration of a nameless (but selected) site in Greece. Four thousand dollars are required for the former enterprise, and eight thousand for the latter. The Institute offers to share its finds with such institutions as are ready to contribute to the expense of the expeditions. The establishment of scholarships of archaeology at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and other colleges is urged, and a membership of one or two thousand declared necessary for the proper support of the Institute. We discover an unkind allusion to a Western ex-Senator in the remark—"The same barbaric spirit that asks 'What have we to do with abroad?' asks also, 'What have we to do with antiquity?'" But this ought not to cost the Institute any friends in that quarter. The Executive Committee consists of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton, President; Martin Brimmer, Vice-President; and Francis Parkman, H. W. Haynes, Prof. W. W. Goodwin, Alexander Agassiz, and Prof. Wm. R. Ware. The Treasurer is Mr. O. W. Peabody, and the Secretary, Mr. E. H. Greenleaf, whose address is Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

—Mr. F. W. Christern sends us the first *fascicule* of the fifth revised edition of Vapereau's 'Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains.' The editor sets forth at length in his preface the great historical events which have occurred since the previous edition (1870), and the consequent changes involved in the present work. The latter, for example, includes all members of the French Parliament; all the French bishops, no longer grouped under the heading "Clergy"; the most prominent cardinals only, instead of a collective article; all the members of the French Institute and its 238 correspondents. To make room for this expansion the names of persons who died before January 1, 1872, have generally been excluded; but the very first name in the Dictionary, that of Aali Pasha, is an exception, and so are Gen. Robert Anderson, Auber, and Charles Babbage. A comprehensive necrology at the end of the volume will atone for the omissions. The longest article (4 pp.) is devoted to Alexander II. of Russia, already needing an addendum for the more recent attempts on his life; the next longest (3½ pp.) to the late Odilon Barrot, whose political vicissitudes during his long life warranted this distinction. Among the American names newly admitted are Louisa May Alcott, T. B. Aldrich, S. Austin Allibone, Susan B. Anthony, Spencer F. Baird (whose succession to Prof. Henry is not chronicled), Dr. F. A. P.

Barnard, Henry Barnard, and H. W. Bellows. The death of Jacob Abbott happened, perhaps, too late for notice. Mr. Alexander Agassiz's services to science are signally underrated in the sole mention of his taking control of the Penikese school after his father's death. Gen. Banks's stalwartism is put to the blush by a belated record about his having "withdrawn from the Republicans in order to get in with (*se rapprocher*) the Democrats." Among the additional foreign names we remark Wm. Allingham, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, Joseph Arch, Walter Bagehot, S. Baring-Gould, Lady Barker, Peter Bayne, Barodet, Franz Abt, J. Alzog, Gen. Alvensleben, the Baedeker, L. Bamberger, Bebel, Edmondo de Amicis, Bakunin, etc. Abd-el-Kader still triumphs over the necrologists. The work will be completed in ten parts by September 1.

—A paper by Mr. Simon Sterne in the April number of the *National Quarterly Review*, on "The Railway Problem," is an interesting statement of the question as it concerns New-Yorkers without attempting any solution of it. Mr. Sterne was the counsel for the Chamber of Commerce during the nine months' investigation of the charges of that body against the railroads of this State, and is of course familiar with enough specific details of the subject to make the general review he gives extremely suggestive. He recites the history of the relations between Government and railroads in England and in this country with considerable fulness, and apparently regards the British Commission as essentially an anticipation of what we shall come to in America ere long. The principal mistake made in dealing with railroads in both countries, according to Mr. Sterne, has resulted from the original misconception as to their true function, which was supposed to be, in 1835, "the transportation of passengers and, under some circumstances, the conveyance of light goods." Another cardinal error was the notion that the economic law of competition would apply to and beneficially regulate railway freight charges; as Mr. Sterne points out: "In railroading, the vanquished continue in business after, as before, insolvency—freed, however, from the obligation to pay interest on bonds and dividends upon stocks; and become more formidable rivals than they had previously been," as a receiver can run his road for operating expenses, whereas a solvent road must earn interest and dividends as well. Combination is so easy and effective in no other business. By a compact between the roads New York City may at any time lose all the advantages with which nature has furnished it. The results of discrimination in freight charges promised to be the extinction of "certain large industries" of this State as well as to work disastrously in many minor ways. The system of discrimination, moreover, is particularly detrimental, owing to its irregularity and, indeed, lack of any system. In fine, Mr. Sterne's article is a dispassionate review, summarizing some points and amplifying others, of the proceedings before the Hepburn Committee, with which our readers must be more or less familiar, but which it is convenient to have here epitomized by an authoritative and competent hand. Mr. G. R. Blanchard replies to Mr. Sterne in an equally elaborate article entitled "Politico-Railway Problems and Theorists," which is a good example of skilful and ingenious destructive criticism. It is not perhaps as illuminating to the disinterested reader as more conspicuous candor would have made it; if Mr. Sterne is one of those "to whom a railway problem is *hasheesh*," the fact is one to be deplored rather than exulted over, we should say.

—The performance of a translation of "Cymbeline" in a Hindu playhouse is described by a writer in the May *Macmillan*, who enjoyed in being present an opportunity not often open to Europeans, he says. The theatre was a temporary building of bamboo and canvas; the stage, a white-washed sand-bank; and some twenty petroleum lamps suspended overhead, the "foot-lights." The audience numbered about five hundred men and children, women seldom appearing in such public places, although the playbill set down the price of admission for "respectable ladies" at four annas, and "disreputable ditto" at eight annas. They were not at all "averse to chaff," and all, as well as most of the actors, including *Imogen*, chewed betel-nut. The performance lasted from 9.10 P.M. to 2.55 A.M., and was introduced by a choric hymn to the god Narayen, and some buffoonery by way of prologue. The play proper was a close translation of "Cymbeline," although the adapter had cut out "the whole of that most un-Shaksperian vision in Act v., his *Deus ex machina* being supplied by a voice from behind the scene"; had "made the king a ludicrously contemptible personage," whose uxoriousness greatly delighted the spectators, "henpecked husbands being no rarities in the East"; had heightened *Cloten's* idiocy considerably; had replaced the dirge beginning "Fear no more the heat of the sun" by a long disquisition from *Blavius* on the doctrine of metempsychosis; and made various minor



modifications. As in Shakspeare's time, all the female parts were acted by boys. There was little or no gesticulation, which want was, however, partially atoned for by the great reserve and dignity of the actors. The part of *Imogen* was played with great skill and sympathy, according to the writer, and the refinement of acting required in the disguised part of *Fidele*, considering that the actor was a boy and had to assume the rôle of a woman disguised as a boy, was illustrated with peculiar success. All the scenery and stage accessories are described as very simple and primitive, but the costumes were very rich and elaborate. "Every player from first to last knew his part thoroughly and spoke it faultlessly."

—In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for April 15, M. A. Geffroy discusses a recent Italian work (by Signor Bertolotti) on the Cenci family, and thus helps to destroy one of the most popular of historic fables, according to which, to borrow M. Geffroy's summary, Beatrice Cenci, "young, beautiful, pious, a miracle of virtue, did, it is true, commit the crime of parricide, but only in heroic defence of her honor. To her youth and beauty the famous portrait of the Barberini palace bears witness. Guido Reni, moved by love and pity, penetrated into her prison on the eve of her execution and reproduced upon his canvas her pure glance, her innocent and gentle features." But, to begin with, there is no evidence to show that Francesco Cenci, though a bad man, attempted the particular crime which has served as justification for his daughter's act, and the accusation seems rather to have been an invention of the defendant's counsel at the last moment, for no mention of it was made during the trial, nor does it occur in the brief. It also appears that Beatrice was not so young as commonly stated, and by no means "innocent"; for her will shows that she had borne a son, whose father was probably the steward Olympio—the servant who actually killed Francesco—and the confinement which she suffered at her father's hands may be accounted for by his natural desire that she should not repeat her misdemeanor. The scandal attaching to the action of the pope in the case vanishes also in the light of the documents discovered and printed by Signor Bertolotti. According to the law of the time the property of an executed person fell to the state, so that the pope would have had no need to confiscate it as alleged. But he really remitted the forfeiture of a large part of the property; the widow of Beatrice's brother got back her husband's share, the creditors were paid, and so were Beatrice's own bequests. The way some of the Cenci property came into the hands of the Borghese was by regular purchase, as is proved by the conveyances here printed. Finally, Guido Reni did not come to Rome till the reign of Paul V., probably in the year 1608—i.e., nine years after Beatrice's death—and the portrait does not seem to have received its present label till the beginning of this century.

—The Norwegian constitution is the only one under which the relations between the executive and the parliament are similar to those existing in this country. The king names the ministers, and these are independent of the parliamentary majority. On the other hand, the Government cannot dissolve the parliament, and the passing of a bill by three successive parliaments (now lasting three years each) overrides the king's veto. But upon one important point the constitution is silent: it says nothing about the ineligibility of the ministers to seats in parliament, nor does it either allow or forbid their sitting in it *ex officio*. In Norway this matter has seemed to both parties of greater importance than it has here, and a controversy about it has been going on for more than fifty years. In 1821 the Government first brought in a bill to permit the presence of the ministers, and the effort was repeated every year till after 1860, the proposition being as regularly rejected. The alleged reasons were that the ministers would assume too great a share in the debates, and that there would be reason to fear their personal influence. In 1861 the Stang ministry entered office, and has stayed, with slight changes, till the present day. Its policy has been a continual effort to increase the power of the crown, in which it has been steadily aided by the reputable part of the press, but opposed by the parliamentary majority, which, owing to the distribution of seats, by no means represents the popular majority. What interests us, however, is the action of this ministry with reference to sitting in the parliament: it at once reversed the policy pursued by its predecessors, holding that, if brought into constant contact with the members of parliament the ministers could not preserve so independent a position, and would often be forced involuntarily to yield to the arguments of the Opposition. The increased Liberal majority gradually came over to the same view, and in 1872 passed the bill formerly desired by the Government by a vote of 80 to 29. It was,

however, vetoed, the advisers of the crown demanding a good deal of further legislation as the price of its assent: their own eligibility to parliament, and the creation of the office of deputy to each of the ministers, who should attend to office business while his chief was attending the session, being the most important. In 1874 a new parliament passed the bill by a vote of 74 to 35, and in 1876 a third parliament, by 82 votes to 29. But this third passage was vetoed as the previous ones had been, on the ground that the measure was a change in the constitution, and did not, therefore, come under the provision of that instrument regulating the veto power. The Opposition won also the election of 1879, and it is not expected that the parliament which met February 2 will accept the last veto as final.

—Much attention has of late been given, both in Scandinavia and Germany, to the study and interpretation of the remarkable Icelandic mythological and legendary lays variously known under the titles of the 'Elder Edda,' the 'Poetic Edda,' and 'Sæmund's Edda' (Sæmundar Edda). These investigations have been rendered possible by the publication, in 1867, of a most careful edition of the text of the eddic lays by Professor Sophus Bugge, of the University of Christiania. The *Nation* (No. 760) has before alluded to the fact that Dr. Gudbrand Vigfússon has shown that the elder Edda, in its existing shape, originated among the Norse population of the Scottish Isles, and that they contain many Keltic proper names. Dr. A. Edzardi, of Leipsic, who has written a series of critical articles for the *Germania*, which he modestly styles "Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der Eddalieder," has been engaged in another branch of eddic study almost equally novel. In a careful investigation published towards the close of last year in the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, edited by Paul and Braune, he shows that the verse of the Edda and the skaldic lays has been largely influenced by the metrical system of the Keltic bards—a fact which, of course, is an additional argument in favor of Dr. Vigfússon's theory of their origin. Meanwhile Dr. E. Wilken has brought forward another, but less tenable, hypothesis relating to the eddic lays. In the introduction to his text of the younger or prose Edda ('Die prosaische Edda im Auszuge') he attempts to prove that the lays of the elder Edda are founded on lost sagas—that the *Völsunga Saga*, for instance, instead of being a later production based on the lays, is the type of many older prose works, mostly no longer existing, from which the poems are derived. The corrupted style of the *Völsunga*, however, shows that it is a far later production, and the Sæmundar Edda contains abundant internal evidence that we now possess it—mutilated and imperfect as it is—in the form or dress given it by its original compilers. The venerable and labor loving Dr. F. W. Bergmann, of the University of Strassburg, continues his eddic criticisms with unabated vigor. Since 1838 he has published eleven volumes, either in German or French, all treating of the Eddas. The latest one is styled 'Die Edda-Gedichte der nordischen Heldensage,' and treats mainly of the Sigurd (Siegfried) cyclus, the Gudrun cyclus, the Atli cyclus, and the other legendary groups of eddic lays. In his forthcoming 'Gedichte der Skalden' this acute and ingenious critic will examine the skaldic poems outside of the Edda. The increasing interest in these early Icelandic monuments is plainly shown by the fact that, in spite of the excellence of Simrock's version of the two Eddas (which has just reached its seventh edition), two other German translations of the Sæmundar Edda have appeared—one by Dr. A. Holtzmann and the other by Hans von Wolzogen. A third has been begun by a female scholar, Rosa Warrens, of Berlin, who has published a rendering of that exquisite fragment, the "Hamdismál" ('Das Lied von Hamde,' Berlin, 1879). In Denmark Dr. Brønsted is carrying still further the researches of Bang and Bugge.

—M. Alphonse Wauters, archivist of Brussels, published in 1878 a volume upon the municipal history of his native country so important that it deserves mention even at this late date. It is entitled 'Les Libertés Communales: essai sur leur origine et leurs premiers développements, en Belgique, dans le Nord de France, et sur les Bords du Rhin,' and is in two volumes in large octavo. It covers more ground than its title promises, being in effect a history of the duchy of Lower Lotharingia and the lesser states into which this was divided, to the close of the thirteenth century. Its defect, indeed, if it may be called such, is that the main topic of the work is sometimes almost swamped in subsidiary matter, especially in a frequent tendency to digression. Moreover, it lacks an index, although there is a tolerably good table of contents. With these defects it still is, no doubt, the best history there is of the communal movement, which was one of the most important chapters in the

municipal history of the middle ages. This is a field of history which Augustin Thierry made peculiarly his own, and his graphic narration of its incidents is not superseded by any later account; nor is his theory of its nature, as associated with the *guild*, or sworn brotherhood, rejected, although he rather exaggerated its application. The most important result of M. Wauters's investigations is expressed in a sentence on p. 366: "if these [the communal movements in Belgium] are compared to the revolution of which Picardy and the Isle of France were the theatre, this last will be found far less intense and far less fruitful in results." In truth, while Thierry begins the movement with the communal revolution at Cambrai (1076), M. Wauters shows that many towns of Belgium—among them Ghent, Bruges, and Liège—had municipal governments at a considerably earlier date. The peculiar importance of the work here done is in showing the political and municipal development of these provinces—partly French and partly German in nationality and in national relations—which were on the border-land between the two great kingdoms, and in a sense independent of both. It was this that gradually drew them together, made them the seat of the great duchy of Burgundy, and finally gave them a united national life.

#### EUGÈNE DELACROIX.\*

THE death of Eugène Delacroix at the age of sixty-five, though distinctly one of the gravest losses French art has suffered in our generation, was hardly to be called premature, and was a loss only in the sense that any unnecessary limitation of the number of works of a man so distinctly the child of the finest and truest artistic inspiration is to be regretted, in the interest of the world of art. He was, by the fragility of his constitution and the terrible wear and tear of a most vivid imagination and a most impulsive temperament, doomed to give out early, and his work bears the impress of a morbid nature tinged by physical peculiarities which, adding to its individuality, adds also to the charm of it for those who enjoy art that runs out of the common rut of academic affiliation.

This strange beauty which, to the greater part of even the Parisian public, was "caviare"; this at times weird and always fitful and inexplicable fascination, which is the guarantee of the permanent power and value of Delacroix's work, is better understood when one has read the personal record of his life contained in his letters. Child of a wayward and eccentric muse, frank and entire in his abandonment to her inspiration, it was impossible that he should ever be understood by any public without a long and authoritative course of training, because there is no public taste which has not been formed on precedent and example, and Delacroix had no precedent or example in all that was peculiar to his artistic nature. There was in his painting the broad trait of musical (in want of a better word analogous to what we know as music, and applicable to painting, but which the Greek included in the same word as pertaining to the Muse) tendency as opposed to the naturalistic or scientific, which Venetian art has established as the true aim of the colorist; but, besides that, there was the peculiar and wayward charm we find in all barbaric art, and most strongly in the Persian carpets and embroidery—a sad, minor scale of color, plaintive, and telling of loss and poetic pain. There were the passion and energy of a nature driven by a flow of ideas too strong for its mechanism to control properly and profit by, and towards the close a morbid insistence on his idiosyncrasies, showing the failing of his hand to execute what his imagination developed as rapidly and vehemently as in his youth.

This is the picture of him in his youth by Philarète Chasles:

"I was at the Lycée with this boy, with olive complexion, flashing eye, mobile features, cheeks hollowed early, and delicate, mocking mouth. He was slender, elegant in figure, with abundant curly black hair, which betrayed a southern origin. . . . Eugène Delacroix covered his copy-books with drawings and caricatures. . . . From his eighth and ninth year this wonderful artist reproduced attitudes, invented curves, drew and varied all outlines, pursuing, torturing, and multiplying them under all aspects with a persistence resembling fury. Everything in Delacroix was vehement, even his friendship, which he kept for me until his death."

The flashes of light one gets on the true character of this great genius here and there through the letters clear up, bit by bit, the portrait indicated in his works and in this sketch. The first bit is from his youthful struggles, with the painfulness of which, in the case of most young French painters, those who know the inside of the great ateliers are acquainted. One of his comrades says:

"We ended by making drawings of machines to attach to the patent papers. I did the linear drawing and Eugène the coloring, the various tints of the wood-work. All this had a certain brilliancy. When I took him the price of his work he was perched in the great gallery, at the top of an immense ladder, copying heads from the "Marriage at Cana" by Veronese. I believe it was the first money he had gained with his pencil, imitating wood, iron, etc., and tinting it with water-color. We were very merry in having earned twelve louis, amusing ourselves in our little chamber and pitying the poor fellows who were obliged to carry out our designs."

In 1821 began the aspirations of the young artist (then twenty-three) to see Italy and the great work of the great masters—aspirations which ran through all his life, to find their last expression combined with the search for health in the final breakdown of his constitution. His only voyages abroad were one to Morocco and one to London. In England he found a new vein of art, which he characterizes, as he does most things he criticises, with the large and generous feeling of a man who conceives no jealousy for the success of another and a different talent.

"I have been," he writes to his friend Soulier, "to Wilkie's, and I had not before appreciated him. His finished pictures did not please me, but in fact his sketches and beginnings are above all praise. Like all the painters of all ages and all countries, he spoils regularly the beautiful things he does. . . . No one has ever rendered the eyes, especially of women, as has Lawrence, and his half-open mouths are perfect. He is inimitable."

A letter to the *Artiste* on the *concours* for young painters is too long to be quoted entire, too solid and logical to be excerpted intelligibly; but in one passage of it Delacroix paints his own nature with such aptness that we must give it:

"The artist, shut in his studio, inspired over his work to begin with, and full of that sincere faith which alone produces great work, happening to look outside of it to the place where he will figure and the judges who await him, finds his movement checked. His eye saddens over his work; too great disparagement awaits this chaste child of his enthusiasm; he lacks the courage to follow it in the career which he sees opening for it. He becomes then his own judge and executioner—he changes, he spoils, he tires himself, he wishes to civilize himself and to polish himself in order not to displease."

One feels that he is only recounting his own experience and pains.

In 1858 he returns, in a letter to M. Sylvestre, to the English painters:

"I have no desire to go back to London; I should find there none of my souvenirs, and, above all, I should not find myself the same to enjoy what one sees at present. The school has changed. Perhaps I should find myself obliged to break a lance for Reynolds, or for that enchanting Gainsborough whom you so justly love. Not that I am the enemy of what is now done in painting in England. I have been struck by the great conscience which this people brings even into matters of the imagination. It seems that even in aspiring to, exaggerate details they are more within the limits of their genius than when they imitate the Italian painters and the Flemish colorists. But what matters the exterior? They are always English under all this apparent transformation. So, in place of making the *pastiches*, merely, of the early Italians, as has become the fashion with us, they mingle with the imitation of the manner of these old schools a sentiment entirely personal; they add the interest coming from the passion for painting, interest which is lacking in general in our cold imitation of the rules and style of the schools gone by. . . . Constable, admirable man! is one of the glories of England. I have already spoken to you of the impression he made on me when I was painting the "Massacre of Scio." He and Turner are true reformers; they got out of the rut of the old landscape painters. Our school, which now abounds in painters of talent in this branch, has greatly profited by their example. Géricault came back, completely upset by one of the great landscapes he sent us [apparently alluding to a picture Constable sent to the exhibition at Paris]."

In reply to a complimentary letter of one of his fellow-painters, he says:

"You ask if I have a secret: it is the same as that of the people, unfortunately few, whose greatest *finesse* consists in always telling the truth. We have been too often told that without certain artifices painting cannot have its full value. In carefully studying Nature, which makes no efforts to produce an effect, we see that it is to following her step by step rather than adding or correcting that we must apply ourselves. There is a man who produces light without violent contrasts, who represents the open air, which we have always been told is impossible; it is Paul Veronese. In my opinion, he is probably the only one who has discovered the whole secret of Nature. Without imitating his manner exactly we may pass by many ways where he has placed genuine lights (*flambeaux*)."

But to show the real meaning of our master when he talks of Nature, and the imitation of her, we must give the cross-light of another passage, also addressed to a painter:

"I have many times taken the liberty to advise artists who paint landscapes not to live continually in the country. The presence of Nature deprives us of any initiative, and it seems to me almost impossible, in

\* "Lettres de Eugène Delacroix (1815 to 1863)." Paris: A. Quantin; New York: F. W. Christern.



presence of the perfection she offers always, not to believe yourself inferior whenever a certain inspiration impels you to make a sacrifice. The system of simple studies from nature seems to me infinitely preferable, as well as leaving the subjects you wish to imitate, of which the memory then only preserves the salient characters."

The neglect of Delacroix while alive, coupled with his extreme modesty in his self-appreciation and his consciousness of his own defects as well as the excellences of others, makes of these letters a record as painful as any in the artist life of the past. He was five times a candidate for the Academy before being elected, four times deferred to men whose names for the most part we do not know. He was rarely able even to secure the notice of the jury of the Salon for the pictures he recommended. He lived with a narrow circle of admirers in a wilderness of antipathies and animosities—himself bating no one, abusing no one, if we except Ingres, whose work he abhorred. The promise made of a work which shall bring to light Delacroix's note-books and literary work, his appreciations of art and artists, offers a hope of one of the most valuable contributions of the century to art literature.

#### THE EARL OF BOTHWELL.\*

THE guilt of Mary, Queen of Scots, will never cease to be a subject of vehement debate; for even if the most positive new evidence for or against her should be discovered, it is certain that this would by no means end the controversy, but only change its object. The new documents would be unhesitatingly declared to be forged. Their production would therefore only open a new chapter in the endless debate. The question remains, nevertheless, one of the most fascinating in the whole field of history, and a large number of readers and students will welcome the appearance, in English, of so important a work as that before us.

Professor Schiern's special service is, as might be expected, in that chapter of the history which was enacted in his own country. Bothwell's residence, imprisonment, and death in Denmark have been made by him the subject of exhaustive research, and it is not likely that any new evidence can be discovered bearing upon these. The most important point here is Bothwell's so-called "testament," or confession, exonerating Mary from all guilt in the matter of Darnley's death. In this matter Mr. Schiern agrees fully with Mr. Burton—indeed, his researches form in part the ground of Mr. Burton's conclusion—that the confession is not genuine. The fact that King James, when he passed a winter in Denmark in 1589-90, found no such evidence of his mother's innocence, both these historians regard as conclusive proof that such evidence did not exist.

This Danish episode occupies, however, only a small portion of the book—four chapters out of twelve—the earlier chapters being devoted to the previous career of Bothwell, and his relations to Mary. The entire question, therefore, of Mary's guilt is discussed with great thoroughness and impartiality; but the result is singularly indecisive. Our author divides the question in two—whether she had a share in the murder of her husband, and "whether she had before the death of Darnley thrown herself into the arms of Bothwell" (p. 159). And of these two questions he decides the first in Mary's favor, while in regard to the second he appears on the whole to be against her. At all events, after going through the whole earlier history until the abduction, and carefully considering her demeanor at the time of the abduction, he adds (p. 245): "The opposition which she there exhibited to Bothwell was at all events so small in comparison with her former brave behavior during the catastrophe which put an end to Riccio's life, that this weakness becomes the weightiest—and properly the only incontrovertible—reason for assuming an earlier and more intimate understanding between her and the Earl than she has plainly admitted." That is, Mary is acquitted of murder, but is found probably guilty of adultery. We must say that this conclusion seems to us a very lame one. The case against Mary in regard to the murder of Darnley is at any rate so strong on its face that her defenders—like Mr. Hosack and Professor Schiern—find their strongest argument to be that of improbability. In their unwillingness to believe so heinous a crime they find for every damaging fact explanations which are certainly plausible and, taken in detail, almost convincing. But add this motive, and the improbability vanishes. If Mary was guilty of adultery with Bothwell, it was no more unlikely that the two should plot together to put her husband out of the way than that the same thing should be done by the

dozens of wretched pairs of whom the annals of crime are full. That she was a crowned queen made no difference.

The conclusion reached is due, we think, to the fact that Prof. Schiern, in considering the question of Mary's complicity in Darnley's murder, treats the casket letters as if they were practically the only source of evidence. He has no difficulty in showing, as Mr. Hosack has done, that these might have been forged; it is, by the way, a striking fact, that the work of Mary's apologists consists almost wholly in showing in detail that every item in a long and strong chain of evidence may be explained away. Each one may be explained away; but when it comes to explaining away all of them, our sense of the power of evidence is shocked. Now, the casket letters may have been forged, but even without them the case against the queen is still exceedingly strong. In fact, these letters contain no evidence at all of a plot to murder—only one little hint to "find some invention more secret by physick"; and the silence upon this point is one of the strongest arguments for their genuineness. Surely if Morton, as Prof. Schiern believes, forged these documents, or got them forged—for it was too delicate work for the rough Morton—he would have made at least this point sure. The Earl of Morton is accused of the forgery, as being the person into whose hands the casket first fell; and we are assured that he was capable of the act, by proof drawn from the fact that when in England in 1571 he was asked by the English Government to communicate the contents of a letter he had received from Denmark, and, in complying with the request, "deliverit a copie, omittand sic thingis as we thocht not meit to be shawin" (p. 137). "We will not defend this deceit, but surely it was a very slight matter compared with the deliberate fabrication of these letters.

The casket letters therefore are, if genuine, direct proof only of Mary's relations to Bothwell; they add nothing whatever, except a motive, to the evidence of her share in Darnley's murder. The account of the murder is related by Prof. Schiern much as it is by Mr. Burton; he makes no attempt, as Mr. Hosack does, to throw doubt upon the testimony in regard to its incidents. Here, however, he misses the very strongest point of the argument. The conspirators were engaged, while Mary was in her husband's room, in carrying the powder into her room, which was directly under his. She then, he says (p. 205), "came down from the king, and past her room, which, if she had been able to enter, she would now have found filled with gunpowder, etc." "Had been able?" What does this mean? Who could prohibit the Queen of Scotland from entering her own bed-room—unless, indeed, as the testimony asserts, she had sent her keys to Bothwell? But whatever the cause, the fact that the conspirators, knowing that she was in the house, ventured for such a purpose to take possession of the room which she, if innocent, might reasonably have been expected to enter at any moment, is a fact that can be explained only as Mr. Hosack does, by throwing doubt on the evidence; and this is a thing which we can do wherever we please, and so get rid of all the historical evidence that we do not fancy. In like manner, Mr. Hosack says not a word of the point brought up by Mr. Burton, in which the casket letters receive remarkable confirmation from independent sources. In short, if we merely look at the sequence of events; that the woman whose husband was murdered on the ninth of February married his murderer on the fifteenth of May; if we consider the reluctance with which she consented in March to bring the accused man to trial; and consider further that her estrangement from her former husband was notorious, while for her last husband she had an affection amounting to infatuation, we shall hardly be inclined to think that this fondness dated from a forcible abduction less than a month before the marriage; and we shall see in the whole series of events a cumulation of evidence which does not need the casket letters to strengthen it. If these letters were forged, they were forged to support a proposition which hardly needed support, by men who thoroughly believed the truth of the charge which they were making.

#### BURNETT'S RECOLLECTIONS.\*

THE taste for biographies and that for books of travel, though not identical, may easily be coincident, and they should both be satisfied by an author who can write in his preface:

"I was born a pioneer, as Nashville at the date of my birth [Nov. 15, 1807] was but a small village, and Tennessee a border-State, but thinly populated. I have been a pioneer most of my life; and whenever, since my arrival in California, I have seen a party of immigrants, with their ox-

\* *Life of James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell.* By Frederik Schiern, Professor of History in the University of Copenhagen. Translated from the Danish by the Rev. David Berry, F.S.A. Scot. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1880. 8vo.

\* *Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer.* By Peter H. Burnett, the first Governor of the State of California. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

teams and white-sheeted wagons. I have been excited, have felt younger, and was for the moment anxious to make another trip."

Mr. Burnett's story is, in fact, typically American in its constant succession of removals—from Tennessee to Missouri; from Missouri to Oregon with the first overland caravan, by whose arrival the population of that Territory was more than doubled; and finally to California. The migration began with his father and father-in-law, both Virginians; to-day all his brothers and sisters who survive are, like himself, dwellers on the Pacific coast. Our author's shiftings were the result of an honorable sentiment now little regarded in his native State—viz., that one should keep faith with his creditors. In this he was but following a maxim of his grandfather and namesake Hardeman, whose injunctions to his posterity were: "First. Pay your honest debts. Second. Never disgrace the family. Third. Help the honest and industrious kin." The best way for Mr. Burnett to incur debt proved to be to engage in mercantile business, and the obligations thus contracted before his thirty-seventh year were not discharged till his forty-fifth, in which interval he was lawyer, farmer, office-holder, and gold-digger.

While Mr. Burnett was a hotel clerk at Bolivar, Tenn., he used to see and hear speak the leading men of the State in that day. Of Sam Houston and Davy Crockett he says:

"Houston, then in the prime of life, was a tall, noble Virginian, possessing a most commanding figure and voice, with a bold, flowery, and eloquent style of oratory. He had a great command of language, and spoke slowly, emphatically, and distinctly, so that all could hear him and all wished to hear him. Newton Cannon was a very plain, earnest, forcible, and rapid speaker, a strict logician, but not a popular orator. While Houston and Cannon were speaking no one ever laughed, as they never dealt in amusing anecdotes. General Houston never succeeded at the bar. His mind was not of a legal cast.

"David Crockett was a man of another cast of mind and manner. He possessed a fine natural intellect, good memory, and great good-nature. He had treasured up all the good anecdotes he had ever heard, and could readily relate many striking incidents of his own career. He was deficient in education, and had no practical knowledge of statesmanship; but he was willing and able to learn, and had the patience to bear ridicule and reproach for the time being. He was an off-hand speaker, full of anecdotes, and kept a crowd greatly amused. His comparisons and illustrations were new and simple, but strong and pointed. Few public speakers could get any advantage of David Crockett before a crowd of backwoods people. His good-natured, honest, jolly face would remind one of Dryden's description

"Of Bacchus—ever fair and ever young."

The picture of life in Missouri at the time of its admission into the Union has features over which it would be pleasant to linger. When in 1822 Mr. Burnett's father removed from Howard County on the Missouri to Clay County, the household goods were towed by men from the bank in flat-boats, and the journey occupied forty days. The chief trade was in skins, honey, and beeswax; cotton was a staple article of production, and domestic manufactures embraced not only cloth, but shoes. Broad-cloth was so seldom seen that country ministers held up the innocent wearer of it in open meeting as acting contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. "Fisticuff fights," in most of which "both parties were severely bruised, bitten, and gouged, and would be weeks in recovering," were "very common," especially at militia trainings. But a deeper interest attaches to the expulsion of the Mormons from Missouri, which was timely for Mr. Burnett, as it gave rise to much litigation by which he profited on beginning to practise. He was counsel both for and against the Mormons, and marched against them as part of the militia, after Bogard's bloody defeat by the Danites. This exciting episode is related at considerable length. Smith's portrait is worth reproducing:

"Joseph Smith, jr., was at least six feet high, well-formed, and weighed about one hundred and eighty pounds. His appearance was not prepossessing, and his conversational powers were but ordinary. You could see at a glance that his education was very limited. He was an awkward but vehement speaker. In conversation he was slow, and used too many words to express his ideas, and would not generally go directly to a point. But, with all these drawbacks, he was much more than an ordinary man. He possessed the most indomitable perseverance, was a good judge of men, and deemed himself born to command, and he did command. His views were so strange and striking, and his manner was so earnest, and apparently so candid, that you could not but be interested. There was a kind, familiar look about him that pleased you. He was very courteous in discussion, readily admitting what he did not intend to controvert, and would not oppose you abruptly, but had due deference to your feelings. He had the capacity for discussing a subject in different aspects, and for proposing many original views, even of ordinary matters. His illustrations were his own. He had great influence over others. As an evidence of this I will state that on Thursday, just before I left to return to Liberty, I saw him out among the crowd, conversing freely with

every one, and seeming to be perfectly at ease. In the short space of five days [after arrest on account of the Danite affair] he had managed so to mollify his enemies that he could go unprotected among them without the slightest danger."

When Mr. Burnett set out for Oregon to help settle the pending fate of the Territory in favor of American ownership, it was "proposed that we should adopt either the criminal laws of Tennessee or those of Missouri for our government on the route"; just as, when it came to establishing a provisional government in Oregon, the non-local laws of Iowa were adopted for convenience. There is in the account of the untried journey to the Columbia River a primitive charm, which is felt also in the subsequent narrative of the overland journey from Oregon to California. The following characteristic incident belongs to the earlier one:

"We passed through some most beautiful valleys, and encamped on a branch of the Powder River, at the Lone Pine. This noble tree stood in the centre of a most lovely valley, about ten miles from any other timber. It could be seen, at the distance of many miles, rearing its majestic form above the surrounding plain, and constituted a beautiful landmark for the guidance of the traveller. Many teams had passed on before me; and at intervals, as I drove along, I would raise my head and look at that beautiful green pine. At last, on looking up as usual, the tree was gone. I was perplexed for the moment to know whether I was going in the right direction. There was the plain beaten wagon-road before me, and I drove on till I reached the camp just at night. That brave old pine, which had withstood the storms and snows of centuries, had fallen at last by the vandal hands of men. Some of our inconsiderate people had cut it down for fuel, but it was too green to burn. It was a useless and most unfortunate act."

A large part of the chapters relating to Oregon is occupied with a defence of the author against charges made in Gray's history of the State. Mr. Burnett's tone is noticeably moderate in this discussion, but we can hardly pronounce candid his excuses for introducing and getting passed a barbarous bill excluding not only slavery but free or freed blacks from the Territory. The law was quickly amended, and then repealed before it could take effect; all which, Mr. Burnett says, is the same thing as if it had never been enacted and (morally) as if it had never been conceived.

Excellent stories about the trappers of the Rocky Mountains find their counterpart in tales of the mining camp and of the curious state of society in California in 1849. With these two extracts we must take our leave of a work which can be recommended without reserve as a wholesome and entertaining contribution to the history of the present century:

"About the last of July the immigrants across the plains began to arrive [at Sacramento], and among them was James S. Thomas, from Platte City, Missouri. I had known him for about three years before I left that State for Oregon in the spring of 1843. He was then a poor young lawyer of admirable character, and was highly esteemed by all who knew him. . . . I at once inquired the time of his arrival, and he informed me it was the previous evening. He said he was *very* anxious to be at work. I at once asked him what he had, and he replied, some mules and a wagon. I said: 'Go sell everything and then come to me, and I will do the best I can for you.' That day he sold everything, and came to my office next morning. I said to him: 'We are to elect a magistrate to-morrow, and I will attend a meeting of citizens called for this evening to make a nomination, and will procure your selection if I can. In case you are selected, my brother-in-law, John P. Rogers, my son, D. J. Burnett, and myself will close our office, and give you one day's electioneering.'

"I attended the meeting and made an earnest, vigorous speech for Thomas, and he received the nomination. Next day we had a warm contest at the polls, as his competitor was well known in the city. Many objected to Thomas upon the ground of his profession. To this objection I replied that while I had nothing to say in defence of lawyers as a class, I would say that Thomas was among the best of his profession. He was elected."

"When I arrived at Sacramento City, I found melons in market. An old man of the name of Swartz cultivated several acres in melons that year, on the west bank of the Sacramento River, at a point some five miles below the city. These melons he sold readily at from one to three dollars each, according to size. From the sale of these melons he realized that year some thirty thousand dollars."

*Sister Dora: A Biography.* By Margaret Lonsdale. (Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1880.)—This is a republication of the sixth English edition of Margaret Lonsdale's life of the remarkable woman, Dorothy Pattison, known as "Sister Dora." Sister Dora was the youngest of ten sisters in a family of twelve children of Hauxwell, England. She was delicate as a child and subject to severe illnesses, which increased rather than retarded the natural activity of her mind. As she grew up she became stronger, and at twenty was even a leader in all out-door sports. Educated but undisciplined, and chafing under the restraint that inaction seemed to impose upon her great bodily and mental powers, it was



natural that, having won her father's reluctant consent after her mother's death, she should leave home and choose a work which her duties as a clergyman's daughter among the poor had rendered familiar to her. She taught the parish school at Little Woolston for three years very successfully, at the same time attending to the sick and poor of the village till her own health gave way. After her recovery she carried out a wish she had long entertained and joined the Protestant Sisterhood of the Good Samaritans at Coatham. Here she was employed alternately in hospital and private nursing, until her work finally centred in Walsall, where she assumed the entire charge of the nursing in the accident hospital, which contained twenty-eight beds. Indeed, she devoted all her powers, her wit and cheerfulness, her skill as nurse and surgeon, her religious faith and her unequalled physical vigor, to the care of the "Black Country" miners, and to the elevation of their life after their discharge from the hospital. Such a life precluded of necessity the formation of any friendships that could return to her the support and sympathy of which she was herself unselfishly prodigal, and when she met a man who was, her biographer says, "her superior in every respect but one—he had no faith in revealed religion," it is not surprising that she returned his devotion with a passion that made it impossible for her to recover completely from the shock of being compelled—on account of his infidelity—to give him up. She had in consequence a severe and nearly fatal illness, and from that time her self-sacrifice became a reckless disregard of her health which was "painful to witness." In June, 1878, typhoid fever having broken out in the hospital, it was closed, and she took a short rest, visiting Paris and London, but studying surgery even there. She had, however, not long to live, as she and her physician alone knew, since cancer was making rapid progress, and she returned to Walsall in October to die two months afterwards. Her last words were: "I have lived alone—let me die alone"; repeating the last until they were obeyed. The narrative is wanting in literary form, sometimes is grammatically awkward, and from beginning to end is marked by a naïveté that seems to be the result of a very slight sense of humor; now and then a touching picture is spoiled in this way, as, "she has been known to sleep with a burnt baby on each arm" (p. 103). It is conspicuously dispassionate, however, which is a rare merit in works of the kind, and which, it need hardly be said, adds greatly to the force of the book.

*Rowlandson, the Caricaturist*: A selection from his works, with anecdotal descriptions of his famous caricatures and a sketch of his life, times, and contemporaries. By Joseph Grego, author of 'James Gillray, the Caricaturist, his life, works, and times.' 2 vols., with about four hundred illustrations. (New York: J. W. Bouton. 1880.)—Thomas Rowlandson was one of the three famous caricaturists whose work belongs to the years, otherwise tolerably barren of art, in Great Britain at least, from 1785 to 1820. Gillray and he were born and their work began to attract attention at about the same time. In 1785 Rowlandson was twenty-nine years old, and Gillray not much older. The third of the triad was not yet living, but in 1811, when Gillray laid down his graver for ever, Rowlandson was still in his prime (indeed, "Doctor Syntax" belonged to that year and the years before and after, and the "Dance of Death" had yet to come), and in 1811 George Cruikshank was already a formidable author of political squibs. It is remarkable, too, how much similarity there is in the work of the three. Differences, of course, we expect to find among them; but they resembled each other in a way not often seen. The two seniors led different lives. Gillray was an engraver with a natural gift for caricatures, so that he found his comic pay better than his high-art productions. Rowlandson was a water-color painter of originality and feeling, and possessed of a power over landscape art which might have led him to great excellence in that direction; but, always in need of money to supply costly dissipation and waste, he was easily brought to doing whatever would pay the most readily. And there were publishers who saw to it that he should do nothing but work for them.

Mr. Grego has now published studies of both of the older caricaturists. The newly-published study of Rowlandson, which is before us, consists of two large square volumes, crowded with outline illustrations. Considered as a Life of Rowlandson, it does not give many incidents or traits which are not in the most accessible works, in Redgrave and Bryan and Nagler. Considered as an account of his engraved works, it is a little unequal and a little informal. Some prints are described at length and others only named; the sizes are not given, nor are the descriptions of such a character as to allow of precise identification of a doubtful print. There is no continuous numbering; so that this work does not constitute a catalogue by whose numbers the separate works can be known—as, "Grego 1212,"

and the like. Moreover, it is expressly stated that completeness has not been found obtainable. A collector of Cruikshank, for instance, needs Mr. Reid's book for the proper identification of his acquisitions; but the collector of Rowlandson will not be the better for Mr. Grego's book, except (and it is an important exception) as a suggestive guide to his researches and enquiries. Collectors, indeed, would seem to be chasing a will-o'-the-wisp when they ask for complete collections of Rowlandson, whether ready-made, for their study, or practicable to be made anew. Mr. Grego relates his experiences in this matter—how no collections at all approaching completeness exist in public museums; how some great private accumulations were inaccessible to him; how he suspects the existence of whole series of caricatures which he has never seen; how he concluded that it was his own collection upon which he must rely, and how he tried to bring that up to approximate completeness, in spite of high and increasing prices and a very scant supply. All this, and indeed the whole book, is very interesting. Those who like history in its "original packages" will enjoy the description of rare political and social caricatures which they will never see, and occasional reproductions of them.

The four hundred illustrations seem to be reproductions by some one of the many modern processes based upon photography. They are not as clear and sharp as they might be, and, when the picture is greatly reduced in scale, this want of clearness is a serious defect. But still, four hundred reproductions, accurate as far as they go, of originals often wholly unobtainable, generally very rare, and never common, have a definite and a not small value.

*Contemporary Portraits*: Thiers, Strauss compared with Voltaire, Arnaud de l'Ariège, Dupanloup, Adolphe Monod, Vinet, Vernet, Robertson. By E. de Pressensé, D.D., author of 'Jesus Christ: his Times, Life, and Work,' 'The Early Years of Christianity,' etc. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. (New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1880. 8vo, pp. 400.)—Besides the "portraits" enumerated in the title-page this book contains two articles of a more properly historical character, "The Antecedents of the Vatican Council" and "The Culturkampf in Germany." Nearly one-third of the volume is devoted to subjects of almost general interest; the latter two-thirds bring before the reader "three eminent representatives of French Evangelical Protestantism and one great English preacher." They do more than that—they bring before us, under traits to a great degree common to Monod, Vinet, and Vernet, the author himself, an equally eminent representative of conservative French Protestantism. Every part of the collection, which consists of recent contributions to periodical literature, will be found interesting by readers to whom analytical character-sketches of men, times, and tendencies are more enjoyable than amusing anecdotes varnished into a semblance of biographical history; but intrinsically the most valuable portions are those in which the eloquent writer, in depicting the growth, mental struggles, and final development of a few contemporary heroes of Christianity, reveals the traits of his own religious ideal.

His own orthodoxy our author broadly unfolds when, speaking of Vernet, he says:

"We fully endorse the saying . . . : 'There is a faith which saves, but there is no dogmatism which saves.' He failed, however, to define with sufficient distinctness, apart from all human systems, what is that saving faith which is the essence of Christianity. . . . It is based upon positive facts; its essential feature is a great miracle, wrought by the Son of God, who 'died for our sins and rose again for our justification.' 'He who believes not that life is come into the world in Jesus Christ, he who thinks he can go to the Father otherwise than by the Son, the Son of the living God, is not a Christian.'"

This saving faith, however, is not to be a blind, traditional belief, according to M. de Pressensé. On the contrary, it must be the fruit of freedom, search for truth, and conviction.

"Timid believers," he says, "seek to stifle doubt by a practical exercise of faith, and flee scientific enquiry as they would the plague. They do not see that in this way they put unbelief in the place of doubt; for the man who is afraid of his own thoughts and dares not look scientific objections in the face, is an unbeliever. It is by the strangest perversion that the stultification of the mind can be mistaken for sanctification, and that the abnegation of intelligence can be supposed to be a Christian virtue. There are pious ignorant people; but ignorance is not in itself pious."

And these views he applies, without reserve, to the relation of man to state and church:

"If man has in his conscience a sufficient criterion of truth, if he is by his very nature in harmony with it, truth cannot be forced upon him

under any pretext by a power outside himself. . . . The magnetic needle does not need to be turned to the pole by force; it tends toward it by a necessity of its nature, and thus becomes the mariner's guide. So it is with the soul. It has a tendency towards the pole of truth, all the more sure because it is spontaneous."

Like Vinet, M. de Pressensé is "as impatient of the yoke of intolerant orthodoxy as of that of the hierarchy," and does "not find the truth embodied in the form of a *systematic creed* even in the Bible itself, which speaks with supreme authority on matters of faith." It is perhaps needless to add that he condemns Bismarck's *Culturkampf* almost as much as the dogmatic enunciations of Pius IX. M. de Pressensé is thus a zealous champion both of faith and freedom; and his championship is marked by the best moral qualities of a leader: ardor tempered by toleration, partisanship restrained by charitableness. The last-named virtue, however, is perhaps too far stretched in some of his biographical sketches. His "Thiers" is all but a panegyric, although the founder of the French republic was never a model of a Christian, and only in his last years an advocate of republican liberty; and Voltaire and Dupanloup—men of the most antagonistic tendencies, though of tendencies equally repugnant to the author—are judged with a mildness which the mere admiration of genius and *esprit* does not sufficiently justify. Strauss alone, the assailant both of Christianity and France—of the latter in 1871—may be said to be treated without favor, though also *sine ira*. The spirit that pervades the whole book is noble, the style is beautiful throughout, and the light thrown upon the evangelical movements of our age—especially in France, Switzerland, and England—must be welcome to thoughtful readers of every shade of religious opinion. The philosophy, however, which underlies the Christian speculations of the author must be said to be merely a philosophy of sentiment. His dogmas are based neither on logical nor on historical deductions; they grow subjectively out of his conscience and pious reverence. He rejects eternal punishment as he rejects critical negation—as repugnant to his feelings; he accepts the supernatural Christ because he feels "lost" without him.

The translation is excellent, but it is to be regretted that the book has not gone through a better revision. We find "Seignior" for Senior (p. 3), "Wissemberg" for Wessenberg (pp. 49, 62), "Hafel" for Hefele (p. 64), "Reimarius" for Reimarus (p. 86), "Miskiewitz" for Mickiewicz (p. 250), "the 17th of July" for the 25th (p. 8), "1860" for 1866 or 1867 (p. 19), "twenty-three departments" for twenty-six (p. 25), "old president" for ex-president (=ancien président, p. 33), "1848" for 1847 (p. 51), and many similar misprints or slips of the pen. "Deism" sometimes incorrectly alternates with "theism," and by a slight anachronism Gibbon is made to figure "at the commencement of this century" (p. 252).

*Le Peuple et la Langue des Mèdes.* Par Jules Oppert. 8vo, pp. xi.-296. (Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie. 1879.)—There seems to be a fascination about that magnificent inscription in three cuneiform languages for whose preservation Darius planned the almost inaccessible side of the mountain of Behistun. Sir Henry Rawlinson's last published work was a new translation of the text of which he took squeezes about forty years ago; and now M. Oppert—whose first work that we remember, published in 1847, in the days when he wrote in his native German, was on the phonology of the language of the Persian column, and whose first work in French, published soon after, was still devoted to the Achaemenian inscriptions—returns in his latest volume to the same subject, and, under the title given above, discusses the language of the second column of the Behistun inscription. The first, or Persian, column was first translated; the third, or Assyrian, did not long baffle research; but the second, the language of the Turanian Medes, has been much more difficult, owing to the fact that in deciphering it it was not practicable to compare it with any other known language, so that to very few scholars did it seem worth while to expend the labor which must bear small fruits, however successful. De Sauley, Westergaard, and Hincks, however, made a fair beginning, as did Sir Henry Rawlinson, although the latter in this, as in other fields, gave very inadequate returns to the public from his ingenious studies. To Mr. Norris, the learned author of the 'Assyrian Dictionary,' we are indebted for the work, published in 1853, 'Memoir on the Seythie Version of the Behistun Inscription,' which has remained by far the chief authority on the subject to the present day, as Haug added nothing, and Holtzmann, in his later and more elaborate attempts of 1862 and 1870, only erred where Norris was correct, and added a few good copies of minor inscriptions.

Having given equal attention to all of the three languages of the

Achaemenian inscriptions, Oppert has advantages over any other scholar in their translation, and the present work on those in the Median tongue marks a great advance on Norris. Besides the great Behistun inscription of Darius, son of Hystaspes, the Median texts include a very short one of Cyrus, seven other rather long inscriptions of Darius, six of Xerxes, and two of Artaxerxes Mnemon, most of them bilingual or trilingual. An extremely interesting point, anticipated, however, by Oppert in 'Records of the Past,' vol. vii. p. 109, is his announcement that there is a distinct mention of the Avesta in the last paragraph of the Median column. Here both the other texts are mutilated. He thus translates it:

"And Darius the king said, By the grace of Ormuzd I have made also a collection of texts in the Persian language, such as previously did not exist. And I have made a text of the Law [Median *ukku*, found in another passage as the translation of the Persian *abasta*, the original of Avesta], and a commentary on the Law, and the benediction and the translations. And I have written and promulgated it all. Thus I have re-established the old book in all the lands, and the people accept it."

Another point that will invite hostile criticism, we think, among scholars of the old Persian is his translation of a Persian text of Darius at Persepolis, in which he finds a mention of Ahriman under the title of "The Other One," *Aniya*. Apart from this, the monotheistic character of the Median, as of the other texts of the Persian kings, is very striking. Accompanying M. Oppert's translations of these texts are a grammar and a glossary, which sufficiently justify the judgment of the alliance of the Median with the Uralo-Altaic languages.

*On Mr. Spencer's Formula of Evolution* as an exhaustive statement of the changes of the Universe. By Malcolm Guthrie. (London: Trübner & Co. 1879.)—Mr. Spencer's 'First Principles' have received first and last from the critics about as complete a pulverization as often befalls a philosophic work. No critique has been as acute and dispassionate as that which Mr. Guthrie presents in these two hundred pages. That the impartiality of tone is somewhat voluntary and affected is more than probable. No critic, after proving the first fifty statements of a writer to be utterly idiotic, can possibly feel as if the fifty-first might very likely be a gem of wisdom, and ought to be approached and analyzed with all the forms of respect. Yet this is the manner of Mr. Guthrie from page to page of his work. The reader ends by finding it rather dry, and longs for a somewhat broader and more sweeping touch. Mr. Guthrie shows that Spencer has not started from "the homogeneous," as he professes, but assumes a differentiation ready-made at the beginning of the universe, thus admitting an arbitrary principle. He proves elaborately Spencer's failure to deduce the evolution of vital organization and of consciousness from other data; he then tries to amend the Spencerian formula, which even amended remains but a partial and vague description of the world's changes; and in an appendix of seventy pages he analyzes the other principal criticisms of Spencer's philosophy.

On the whole, we must say that there is a certain Scottish lack of lightness and humor in the work—an over-thoroughness which makes the reader's sympathies lie rather with the victim of so elaborate a post-mortem examination. Do negative polemics on such a scale, after all, pay? And is it not breaking a butterfly upon a wheel to take two hundred pages to argue down such flimsy vagueness as the 'First Principles'? No philosopher achieves such vast popularity as Spencer except by reason of some real merit. Mr. Spencer's principal merit is his pluck in trying to do what every philosophy must do—to formulate the phenomenal universe in a simple, positive, dogmatic way. His next merit is that he is profuse of facts familiar as well as remote, and untechnical in his manner of exposition. When another author shall arise, who, standing as little aloof from the plane of the popular intelligence as Mr. Spencer, shall make a synthesis as truly complete as his is spuriously so, as distinct in its formulation as his is equivocal, as consistent as he is incoherent, that author will easily drive Mr. Spencer from his stronghold in the popular imagination. But so long as the acuter minds content themselves with simply pooh-poohing and sneering, so long will their voices be unheard and Spencerism fill its broad berth. What matters a little more or less of vagueness in a philosophy which, after all, provisionally performs its fundamental function—the function of speaking the people's language, of enveloping the world in a single conception, and of deriving our own ideals of duty and the facts of objective existence from one and the same principle? When the philosophy of the critics performs this function better, their critical labors will not be needed, for the so-called synthetic philosophy will simply be outgrown.



